DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 017 SP 022 945

TITLE	An Evaluation of the Nutrition Services for the Elderly. Volume IV. Appendices.
INSTITUTION	Kirschner Associates, Inc., Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Opinion Research Corp., Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration on Aging (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 83
CONTRACT	105-77-3002
NOTE	274p.; For related documents, see SP 022 942-946.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Delivery Systems; Dining Facilities; Eating Habits; Federal Programs; *Food Service; Health Programs; Homebound; Loneliness; Nutrition; *Older Adults; *Outreach Programs; Participant Characteristics; Participation; Physical Health; Program Evaluation; *Research Methodology; Social Isolation
IDENTIFIERS	Congregate Dining; Meal Programs; Nutrition Services

ABSTRACT

This document is part of a five-volume nationwide study of Nutrition Services operations and elderly citizens participating in congregate dining and home delivery services authorized by Title III-C of the Older Americans' Act. This volume contains all technical appendices and is intended as a resource document. The Methodology Appendix is included as well as 29 other appendices that report, in detail, the analytic techniques used and measures of statistical significance referred to in other volumes. (JMK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED234017

Volume IV

APPENDICES

AN EVALUATION OF THE NUTRITION SERVICES FOR THE ELDERLY

Conducted for

THE ADMINISTRATION ON AGING
OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

May 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ORC
Opinion Research Corporation
North Harrison Street, Box 183, Princeton, NJ 08540

North Harrison Street-Box 183
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
(609) 924-6000

400 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611
(312) 329-9760

One Penn Plaza
New York, NY 10119
(212) 736-3077

Four Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 421-1198

600 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20024
(202) 484-5092

Opinion Research Corporation
An Arthur D. Little Company

SP 022 945

Volume IV

APPENDICES

AN EVALUATION OF THE NUTRITION SERVICES FOR THE ELDERLY

Conducted for

THE ADMINISTRATION ON AGING
OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

By

KIRSCHNER ASSOCIATES, INC.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87016

OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Contract # 105-77-3002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Overview of the Report		1
Methodology Appendix		3
Appendix A	Detailed Tabulations: Demographic Profiles of Participants and Non-Participants	A-1
Appendix B	Detailed Tabulations: Mobility and Health Characteristics of Participants and Non-Participants	B-1
Appendix C	Detailed Tabulations: Lifestyle, Dietary, and Affective Characteristics of Participants and Non-Participants	C-1
Appendix D	Frequency of Site Attendance/Home Delivery	D-1
Appendix E	Likelihood of Future Attendance Among Former Congregate Participants	E-1
Appendix F	Elderly Characteristics Related to Perceived Site Contributions Policy	F-1
Appendix G	Increased Contributions	G-1
Appendix H	Perceived Savings Associated with Service Attendance and Home-Delivery Service	H-1
Appendix I	Pleasantness of Congregate Sites	I-1

		Page
Appendix J	Awareness of Site Nutrition Education	J-1
Appendix K	Participation in Site Nutrition Education	K-1
Appendix L	Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance	L-1
Appendix M	Utilization of Site Shopping Assistance	M-1
Appendix N	Awareness of Site Medical Assistance	N-1
Appendix O	Utilization of Site Medical Assistance	O-1
Appendix P	Frequency of Participation in Site Activities	P-1
Appendix Q	Frequency of Socializing at Sites	Q-1
Appendix R	Discriminant Function Analysis: Congregate Participants vs. Home-Delivered Meal Recipients	R-1
Appendix S	Discriminant Function Analysis: Congregate Participants vs. Home-Delivered Meal Recipients vs. Former Participants	S-1
Appendix T	Discriminant Function Analysis: Current vs. Former Congregate Participants' Perceptions of Congregate Sites	T-1
Appendix U	Dietary Analyses	U-1
Appendix V	Dietary Discriminant Function Analyses for Congregate Participants	V-1
Appendix W	Dietary Discriminant Function Analyses for Home-Delivered Meal Recipients	W-1

		Page
Appendix X	Dietary Discriminant Function Analyses for Non-Participating Neighbors	X-1
Appendix Y	Discriminant Function Analysis-Tracked Program Participants Who Have Remained Active in the Program vs. Tracked Non-Participating Neighbors Who Have Remained Non-Participants	Y-1
Appendix Z	Discriminant Function Analysis-Tracked Program Participants Who Have Remained Participants vs. Tracked Program Participants Who Have Left the Program	Z-1
Appendix AA	Discriminant Function Analysis-Tracked Non-Participating Neighbors Who Have Remained Non-Participants vs. Tracked Non-Participating Neighbors Who Have Entered the Program	AA-1

Overview of the Report

The evaluation of the Nutrition Services for the Elderly was jointly conducted by Kirschner Associates, Inc. and Opinion Research Corporation. The Final Report is available in five separate volumes.

This volume (Volume IV) contains all technical appendices and is intended as a resource document. The Methodology Appendix is included as well as twenty-seven others that report in detail the analytic techniques used and measures of statistical significance referred to in other volumes.

Other volumes of the Final Report include:

Volume I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Volume II: ANALYTIC REPORT

- Executive Summary
- Wave I vs. Wave II Program Operations
- Program Impacts
- Supportive Services
- Contributions
- Priority Elderly
- Home-Delivery Service

Volume III: DESCRIPTIVE REPORT

This volume presents an explication of the evaluation data base. It is intended as a resource volume, as its findings have been refined and subjected to the focused analyses presented in Volume II: ANALYTIC REPORT. The volume includes:

- Program Characteristics
- Interviews with Participants and Non-Participants

Volume V: QUESTIONNAIRES

This volume contains the questionnaires used by the contractors in executing the evaluation. It is intended as a resource volume.

METHODOLOGY APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Overview of the Study	6
II.	Sample of Congregate Meal Sites	8
III.	Project Review Procedures	12
	A. Data Collection Periods	12
	B. Project Review Data Sources and Instruments	12
	C. Field Work Procedures and Quality Control	17
	D. Telephone Follow-up	17
IV.	Procedures for Interviewing Elderly Participant and Non-Participant Groups	18
	A. Data Collection Periods	18
	B. Overview of Procedures	18
	C. Participant and Non-Participant Groups	19
	D. Sampling of Participants and Non-Participants	25
	1. Sampling at Revisited Wave I Sites (Pre-1975 Sites)	27
	2. Sampling at Post-1975 Sites	32
	E. Verification of Interviews	35
	F. Questionnaires	35
	G. Interviewer Training	39
	1. Day 1	39
	2. Day 2: 24-Hour Dietary Recall	39

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

		Page
A-1	Locations of Sample Meal Sites	9
A-2	Sample Sites by State	10,11
A-3	Project Review Data Sources and Sample Size	13
A-4	Completed Elderly Interviews by Day of the Week	20
A-5	Total Number of Elderly Interviews Conducted During Wave II	22
A-6	Total Number of Elderly Interviews Conducted During Wave II by Site	23,24
A-7	Wave II Disposition of Tracked Wave I Respondents	26
A-8	Respondent Selection Form for New Sample of Non-Participating Neighbors	33
A-9	ORC Site Interviewer Training Schedule	40

I. Overview of the Study

This evaluation of AOA Title III nutrition services for the elderly was originally designed as a longitudinal study, intended to examine representative samples of nutrition service providers and their congregate meal sites at yearly intervals. The first, baseline, set of data was gathered during 1976, consistent with the longitudinal design.[1] At that time 91 congregate sites were visited, representing 89 nutrition service providers scattered over 40 states. The data gathered can be conceptualized as two related studies: (1) A project review, consisting of interviews with staff members at various levels in the nutrition service hierarchy plus data gathered from provider records and visits to each of the 91 congregate sites; and (2) Interviews of the elderly, consisting of interviews with Title III nutrition service participants and with elderly persons who were eligible for, but not receiving, service. The project review was conducted by staff of Kirschner Associates and the elderly interviews were conducted by staff of Opinion Research Corporation (ORC). Since Kirschner Associates and Opinion Research Corporation gathered data independently, potential biasing of one set of data by the other was minimized. However, because instrument development and data gathering activities were closely coordinated, the resultant total available data base affords many opportunities for collaborative analyses drawing upon both the project review and elderly interview components.

Wave II was originally scheduled to be conducted soon after Wave I was completed, but the second wave of data collection (the principal subject of the present report) did not occur until 1982. Thus, some planned longitudinal aspects of the study have been lost. At present the evaluation may be considered either as a six-year follow-up study or as two independent studies of nutrition services, separated by a six-year interval.

In most major respects, the methodology used in 1982 was consistent with that used in 1976. In certain details the methodology changed from

---

[1] Two prior reports provide detailed descriptions of the original methodology of the evaluation: (1) Longitudinal Study Design for Evaluation of the National Nutrition Program for the Elderly, Kirschner Associates, Inc., September, 1974; and (2) Longitudinal Evaluation of the National Nutrition Program for the Elderly; Report on First-Wave Findings, Opinion Research Corporation and Kirschner Associates, Inc., January, 1979.

the original to the present wave. Virtually all of these changes involve the project review component. For example, in 1976, many nutrition providers were not under the jurisdiction of area agencies on aging, and consequently representatives of one or more other agencies were interviewed at some locations. In 1982, all service providers were overseen by an area agency, and consequently no "other agency" representatives were interviewed.

Because of other structural changes in program operation and shifts in interests of the Administration on Aging, some original questions were deleted from the 1982 interview forms. For example, questions about provider history and specific questions about interagency relationships were dropped. Many questions about funding and operating costs were dropped because first-wave experience revealed that useful data could not be obtained within the resources available for this evaluation.[1]

Finally, many of the originally open-ended questions included in the project review were restructured on the basis of 1976 data to better permit quantitative analyses. In large measure, however, the project review methodology followed in 1982 was comparable to that in 1976. In the more detailed description presented below, the 1982 methodology will be summarized and, where relevant, departures from the 1976 procedures will be pointed out.

In the elderly interviews component of the study, there was very little change in interview content and other procedures. However, there were two major departures from the original design (and 1976 procedures): (1) elimination of one of the two comparison groups of non-participating elderly studied during 1976 and (2) introduction of a separate sample of home-delivered meal recipients. These changes are discussed later.

The following sections of this appendix describe the 1982 methodology for this evaluation and summarize the consistencies and differences between the 1982 and 1976 waves of data collection.

---

[1] In 1981 an independent study assessed both the costs and the quality of meals served by Title III funded providers. See Analyses of Food Service Delivery Systems Used in Providing Nutrition Services to the Elderly, Kirschner Associates, Inc., June, 1981.

II. Sample of Congregate Meal Sites

The basic sampling unit of this evaluation was the congregate meal site. For the 1976 data collection wave, 91 sites were selected, representative of all sites operating within the contiguous United States during 1975 which were then receiving AOA Title VII funds. The sample was stratified by region and weighted by number of meals served, thereby assuring representativeness both geographically and in terms of all meals being served under the program.

The 1976 sample served as a starting point for the 1982 sample, but was reduced in size for budgetary reasons and altered to reflect the fact that the number of sites in operation had approximately doubled since the original data collection. Specifically, the 1982 sample consisted of 70 congregate meal sites representing 70 service providers scattered over 29 states. (Tables A-1 and A-2 summarize geographic characteristics of the 1976 and 1982 samples.) The 1982 sample was composed of 34 sites which had been visited in 1976 plus 36 sites which had opened since 1975. The 1976 sites revisited during 1982 were selected randomly from those in the original sample which were still in operation. The 36 new sites in the 1982 sample were selected from a list of all sites in operation during Spring of 1980 which had opened since 1975.[1] The list was stratified by the ten DHHS regions, excluding sites in Alaska and Hawaii. Each site was weighted by the number of meals it served on an average day of operation. Thus, as was the original sample, the sample of 36 post-1975 sites was representative geographically and in terms of all meals being served by those sites. Because the entire sample of 70 sites was composed of two subsamples, each representing proportionate subpopulations, the entire 1982 sample was representative of all Title III nutrition services nationwide.[2]

---

[1] The list of the population of post-1975 sites was obtained during a telephone survey of all 1155 nutrition service providers in operation during Spring, 1980. A report of this survey is included in Analyses of Food Service Delivery Systems Used in Providing Nutrition Services to the Elderly, Kirschner Associates, Inc., June, 1981.

[2] There were minor departures from strict representativeness in selection of the 1976 sample which were not followed in the updating. These details are described in the Report on First-Wave Findings.

TABLE A-1

LOCATIONS OF SAMPLE MEAL SITES

Location	Numbers and Percentages of Sites: 1976 Sample (n = 91)	1982 Sample (n = 70)	1980[1] Pop.	% of Meals Served in 1980[2]
By DHHS Regions				
I	7 (8%)	4 (6%)	(6%)	(6%)
II	9 (10%)	7 (10%)	(7%)	(8%)
III	10 (11%)	6 (9%)	(10%)	(8%)
IV	15 (17%)	12 (17%)	(17%)	(17%)
V	18 (20%)	14 (20%)	(24%)	(21%)
VI	12 (13%)	9 (13%)	(12%)	(14%)
VII	6 (7%)	6 (9%)	(7%)	(6%)
VIII	2 (2%)	2 (3%)	(5%)	(5%)
IX	8 (9%)	7 (10%)	(8%)	(11%)
X	4 (4%)	3 (4%)	(4%)	(4%)
By Five Regions				
Northeast	21 (23%)	14 (20%)	(18%)	(21%)
Central	24 (26%)	20 (29%)	(30%)	(28%)
Rim South	22 (24%)	21 (30%)	(24%)	(24%)
South	9 (10%)	2 (3%)	(9%)	(7%)
West	15 (17%)	13 (19%)	(19%)	(20%)

[1] Percentage distribution of all sites in operation within the contiguous 48 states during Spring 1980, ascertained through a telephone survey of all providers. See Analyses of Food Service Delivery Systems Used in Providing Nutrition Services to the Elderly, Kirschner Associates, Inc., June, 1981.

[2] Percentage of all meals served by all sites within the contiguous 48 states, ascertained through the 1980 telephone survey.

TABLE A-2

SAMPLE SITES BY STATE

Alabama

*Childersburg

Arkansas

Des Arc

California

*Auberry
*Jackson
Los Angeles
Oakland
Paso Robles
*Taft
Van Nuys

Colorado

*Central City
Sterling

Delaware

Lewes

Florida

Fort Lauderdale
Jensen Beach

Georgia

*Douglasville

Illinois

*Chicago
*Metropolis
W. Frankfort

Iowa

Persia

Kansas

Belleville
*Girard
*Leavenworth

Kentucky

Brownsville
Ledbettere
*Warsaw

Maryland

*Grantsville
Pikesville

Massachusetts

Brockton
*New Bedford
*Worcester

Michigan

Detroit
Pinckney
*Trenton

Minnesota

Anoka

Missouri

*Kansas City

Nebraska

*Lincoln

New Jersey

Cherry Hill
*Lakewood
Parsippany

*Indicates sites sampled during Wave I (1976)

TABLE A-2 (Continued)

New Mexico

Tularosa

New York

Brooklyn
*Canastota
*Hempstead
*Watertown

North Carolina

Dunn
Kenansville
*Lenoir

Ohio

Akron
*Canton
*Cincinnati
Cleveland

Oklahoma

*Henryetta

Oregon

North Bend
*Estacada
*Medford

Pennsylvania

*McAlisterville
Philadelphia
*Port Allegheny

Tennessee

*Kingsport
*Old Hickory

Texas

Austin
Decatur
*Houston
LaMarque
*San Antonio
*San Ygnacio

Vermont

*Pittsford

Wisconsin

*Wapun
Westboro
Wilton

*Indicates sites sampled during Wave I (1976)

III. Project Review Procedures

A. Data Collection Periods

The 1982 project review was conducted between June 1, 1982 and August 17, 1982. The typical procedure was for one of 29 Kirschner staff members to visit each provider on several occasions distributed over a one-to-two-week period, during which time nutrition service staff members were interviewed, information was retrieved from records, and observations were made at the congregate meal service on three different weekdays. In a few instances the schedule of site operation and/or the distances involved required that only one or two visits be made to the site.

The 1976 project review data were gathered according to the same protocol, between August 9, 1976 and December 12, 1976. The average interval of time lapsed between the 1976 and the 1982 observations and interviews was 69 months, just short of six years.

B. Project Review Data Sources and Instruments

The project review data were gathered during personal interviews with program staff at five levels in the nutrition service hierarchy plus members of providers' advisory councils (where relevant), from provider records, and from observations at each congregate meal site. The staff interviews were scheduled in advance, usually in descending order through the administrative hierarchy, and ranged in length from half an hour to two hours or longer. Each interview followed a structured questionnaire composed of yes-no, multiple-option, and open-ended items. The questionnaires were similar to those used in 1976, although as noted above, there had been some change in the questions included and some restructuring to reduce the number of open-ended questions.

The basic sampling unit of this evaluation was a congregate meal site, and the staff interviews therefore were conducted with persons responsible for operation of each sample site. (The specific positions interviewed, and the numbers of interviews at each position, are summarized in Table A-3.) None of the intended interviewees refused to participate; the

TABLE A-3

PROJECT REVIEW DATA SOURCES AND SAMPLE SIZE

Source and Instrument	Number
Questionnaire for State Nutrition Service Directors	29
Questionnaire for Area Agency Directors	67
Questionnaire for Nutrition Service (Provider) Directors	70
Questionnaire for Nutritionists/Dieticians	54
Questionnaire for Advisory Council Members	60
Questionnaire for Site Managers	70
Data Collection Form for Records and Operations	70

completion rate was 100%. Thus, the numbers of interviews reveal that the 70 meal sites in the sample are administered by 70 service providers, overseen by 67 area agencies on aging (there are three instances in the sample where two sample sites fall within the same area), across 29 states. Not all providers employ a nutritionist/dietician and not all providers have an active advisory council, so the numbers of those interviews are less than 70. The following paragraphs summarize the content of the respective data collection instruments.

Questionnaire for State Nutrition Service Directors. The 29 state-level respondents were asked questions about the organization and scope of nutrition services within the state, the roles of the state office and frequency of contact with sample providers, and problems associated with the sample provider or with operation of nutrition services generally. Demographic information also was gathered for each state director interviewed as well as for all other project review interviewees. To obtain these interviews, all state offices on aging were contacted by mail and by telephone to identify the person most cognizant of nutrition services within each state. The appropriate field staff member then scheduled and conducted the interview.

Questionnaire for Area Agency on Aging Directors. The interview with area agency directors was structured to gather information about the needs for and availability of various services for elderly persons within the area. Also gathered was data about the number of nutrition service providers within the area, the reporting and assistance relationships between area agencies and sample providers, and the area agency directors' evaluations of the sample providers' services.

Questionnaire for Nutrition Service Directors. This questionnaire provided an extensive amount of information about the organization and operation of local nutrition services. The directors were asked about policies regarding participant recruitment, monetary contributions by participants and by any staff who ate meals at the congregate sites, the average amount of contributions, availability and nature of various support services to nutrition participants, and their home delivery program. Other

questions addressed policies regarding staff recruitment and selection, volunteerism, staff training, and the role and impact of the advisory council (if one existed). The directors provided rankings and ratings regarding the relative needs of elderly persons within their service area, relative benefits of the nutrition service to participants, alternate strategies for delivering services, and their relationships with area and state agencies. The nutrition service directors' questionnaire was lengthy, and was in some instances administered over two sessions rather than one. In spite of the length of the instrument, almost all of the 70 directors were enthusiastic about contributing to the study and provided detailed responses to the questions posed.

Questionnaire for Nutritionists/Dieticians. This questionnaire was administered only if the nutrition service provider employed or directly received services of a dietician or nutritionist. Fifty-four of the providers did. The nutritionists/dieticians were asked about their roles in the program, their views regarding goals, impacts, and problems with the nutrition services, and the nature of nutrition education activities available through the provider.

Questionnaire for Advisory Council Members. A group interview procedure was used to complete this questionnaire at each of the 60 providers which had active advisory councils. One, two, or three council members were assembled for each interview, depending upon availability of the members. (A total of 97 council members was included in the 60 interviews, including 74 participant members, 7 provider-staff members, 4 area agency staff members, and 12 other-agency-staff members.) The advisory council members were asked to identify areas of council activity, the level of influence of the council, and the nature of council operation. Council members also were asked about their methods for evaluating nutrition service operations, their views on the needs of elderly people, and their opinions about nutrition service operations.

Questionnaire for Site Managers. Like the Nutrition Service Director Questionnaire, the Questionnaire for Site Managers was a long and detailed instrument which often required two or more hours to complete. A major portion of this interview dealt with the availability and nature of various

support services to site participants. In addition, the managers were asked about meal service schedules and operations, staffing, volunteerism, and staff training. They also were asked about participant recruitment practices, participant contributions for meals, and the availability and operation of home delivered meal service through the site. Finally, the site managers were asked to evaluate needs for various services and relative benefits of the nutrition service program to participants. Several of the items of this questionnaire were identical to ones on the Questionnaire for Nutrition Service Directors, permitting some measures of consensus regarding program policy and operation.

Data Collection Form for Records and Observations. This lengthy instrument assembled detailed information obtained from provider records regarding the numbers of persons participating in the congregate and home delivery programs at both site and provider-wide levels and the demographic characteristics of participants. Numbers and demographic characteristics also were recorded for paid staff members and volunteers. As noted above, all 70 sample meal sites were visited, normally on three separate occasions. From these visits, data were recorded concerning the numbers of congregate and home delivered meals prepared (or ordered) and served. Site and provider meals statistics for a recent quarter also were obtained from provider records, thereby providing two independent measures of service level for a given site.

The visits by Kirschner staff to the congregate sites also permitted observation of meal service procedures and a variety of site characteristics including location, facilities, and patterns of interaction among participants and between participants and staff. The meal site environment was evaluated along many dimensions including accessibility, safety, spaciousness, and appearance. The general procedure for making observations was for the Kirschner staff member to use the Data Collection Form as a guide for observation during the three site visits, formulating the actual evaluations of site characteristics following the last visit.

C. Field Work Procedures and Quality Control

Project review data were gathered by 29 Kirschner field research associates, who were graduate students or practicing professionals in gerontology or a related area of human service. Each associate attended a two-day training session during which the data collection instruments and protocol were studied in detail. The training sessions included role-playing and problem-solving exercises designed to assure a uniform interpretation and administration of the instruments. During field work, central staff members were available by telephone to help the field staff with logistical and procedural details.

Kirschner Associates contacted state and provider-level staff by telephone and/or mail during Spring, 1982, to inform them of the study and request their participation. Opinion Research Corporation staff contacted each sample congregate site by telephone to verify their location. Thus, the nutrition service providers in the sample were generally aware of their selection into the sample prior to their being contacted by a field research associate. The field research associate then scheduled interviews with each staff member at times mutually convenient.

The selection, training, and protocol described above is very similar to that followed for the 1976 field work. The major difference between the two waves was in the number of sites assigned to each field associate. In 1976, no field associate visited more than two sites; most visited only one. In 1982, only two associates were assigned a single site; fourteen associates visited two sites, ten visited three sites, and three visited four sites. Therefore, the evaluations of site characteristics made during 1982 may be more comparative in nature than they were in 1976.

D. Telephone Follow-Up

Following completion of the 1982 project review field work, a telephone follow-up procedure was undertaken to assure that the project review interviews had taken place as reported and to measure the consistency of responses to various types of questions. Random samples of 30 area agency directors, 30 nutrition service directors, and 30 nutritionists/dieticians were recontacted, asked about the original interview and re-administered

several questions. The telephone follow-up provided 100% verification that the original interviews had been completed as reported. The response consistency analyses revealed a high degree of reliability for the most simple, objective questions (for example, questions requiring yes-no or listing responses about program operations) and somewhat lower reliability for more complex evaluative questions (for example rating quality of service or providing percentage estimates of need for various services.)[1] The consistency analyses, plus analyses of missing data and comparisons of alternate sources of information about a given provider, were used to make judgments about how to analyze and interpret the project review data.

IV. Procedures for Interviewing Elderly Participant and Non-Participant Groups

A. Data Collection Periods

During 1982 ORC Site Interviewers conducted personal interviews with elderly participant and non-participant groups from late May, 1982 through July 15, 1982. A team of 3-5 Site Interviewers was assigned to conduct these personal interviews at each of the 70 sample locations.

In the 1976 phase of the evaluation (Wave I), personal interviews with elderly respondents were conducted at two times of the year: August 17 - October 29, 1976; February 4 - March 9, 1977.

B. Overview of Procedures

Procedures used during 1982 were designed to be consistent with the approach employed during 1976. Site interviewers, under close supervision, were responsible for sampling of elderly respondents qualified to be interviewed, locating elderly, securing their permission to be interviewed, and completing the appropriate questionnaire with members of various elderly participant and non-participant groups.

---

[1] A detailed report of these analyses and their implications was submitted to AOA: Report on Data Quality for the 1982 Project Review Data, Kirschner Associates, October 7, 1982.

Elderly respondents were qualified to be interviewed if they were 60 years of age or older, or if they were spouses of program participants.

Elderly were interviewed on each day of the week except Monday, because a major portion of the interview was a 24-Hour Dietary Recall assessing the previous day's dietary intake. Because Sundays are often atypical dietary intake days, Monday interviews were precluded to avoid biasing the dietary intake data. Also, because the dietary intake analyses employed consumption of a nutrition service meal as an analytic variable, and no sampled congregate meal sites operated on Sundays, Monday interviews were not conducted. (Table A-4 shows the distribution of completed interviews by day of the week.)

Interviewing was conducted primarily during the day. Whenever possible, Site Interviewers conducted interviews at the respondent's residence so as to minimize intrusion into site activities and ensure confidentiality of responses during the interview.

C. Participant and Non-Participant Groups

Interviews were conducted with four basic groups of elderly respondents:

- Congregate meal site participants
- Neighbors of congregate meal site participants
- Home-delivered meal recipients
- Former congregate meal site participants

Each of these elderly populations was interviewed during the 1976 phase of the evaluation with the exception of home-delivered meal recipients, as the Title III home delivery program had not yet been initiated. During the earlier study, interviews were also conducted with a sample of elderly who lived in areas which, at that time, were not served by the Title III program. The original design for the 1982 study also called for sampling elderly who lived in locations not yet served by the Title III services. However, due to the substantial growth of the program[1], relatively few

[1] See Analyses of Food Service Delivery Systems Used in Providing Nutrition Services to the Elderly, Kirschner Associates, Inc., June, 1981.

TABLE A-4

COMPLETED ELDERLY INTERVIEWS BY
DAY OF THE WEEK

Day of Week	Number of Interviews	Percent of Interviews
Sunday	8	*
Tuesday	823	24%
Wednesday	969	28%
Thursday	797	23%
Friday	594	17%
Saturday	229	7%
Not Reported	18	*
TOTAL	3,438	99%[1]

[1]Percent less than 100% due to rounding.

*Denotes a percent less than 1%.

areas within reasonable proximity of congregate sites remained unserved during 1982. Because of the logistical difficulties in sampling elderly who did not have an opportunity to join the nutrition program, this comparison group was deleted from the 1982 component of the evaluation. In the 1976 study, this sample was referred to as Comparison Group II.

Below, we briefly describe each of the elderly populations interviewed during Wave II (1982) of the evaluation. (Table A-5 displays the total number of interviews completed with each population and sub-population. Table A-6 shows the distribution of completed interviews by site.)

- Congregate Meal Site Participants

  This sample includes all elderly who attended congregate dining sites, and is further divided into two sub-groups of elderly: those who recently entered the congregate program, and those who were longer-term participants. The vast majority of recent entrants entered the program within one year of being interviewed by ORC Site Interviewers. Longer-term participants, on the other hand, had nearly all been attending the congregate meal program for more than one year before being interviewed.

- Non-Participating Neighbors

  Elderly in this population are neighbors of congregate meal site participants and constitute an important comparison group. Although non-participating neighbors qualify to join the program, they elected not to.

- Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

  This sample includes elderly who receive Title III funded meals delivered to their residences. Not all congregate dining sites have attached Title III home delivery programs.

- Former Participants

  Elderly in this group were not purposely sampled during either Wave I (1976) or Wave II (1982). These individuals were located and interviewed in the course of Site Interviewers' sampling of other participant and non-participant groups.

TABLE A-5

TOTAL NUMBER OF ELDERLY INTERVIEWS
CONDUCTED DURING WAVE II

Elderly Population	Number of Interviews
Congregate Participants	1,735
(Recent Entrants)	(857)*
(Longer Term)	(878)*
Non-Participating Neighbors	1,039
Home-Delivered Meal Recipients	415
Former Participants	249
TOTAL	3,438

*Numbers in parentheses are included in congregate participants

TABLE A-6

TOTAL NUMBER OF ELDERLY INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED DURING WAVE II BY SITE

	Congregate Participants			Non-Participating Neighbors	Home Delivered Meal Recipients	Former Participants
	Total	Recent Entry	Longer Term			
Lakewood, NJ	28	24	4	20	10	2
Watertown, NY	21	17	4	19	--	7
McAlisterville, PA	30	14	16	20	1	1
Metropolis, IL	27	16	11	12	11	1
Chicago, IL	24	15	9	14	--	6
Trenton, MI	8	5	3	5	1	6
Canton, OH	23	16	7	19	--	8
Waupun, WI	27	12	15	17	10	6
Leavenworth, KS	26	21	5	16	--	5
Lincoln, NE	27	15	12	14	--	8
Childersburg, AL	30	19	11	19	10	3
Douglasville, GA	29	18	11	20	10	1
Lenoir, NC	21	14	7	20	5	8
Kingsport, TN	17	17	--	21	14	9
San Ygnacio, TX	35	18	17	10	7	2
San Antonio, TX	27	21	6	18	--	5
Auberry, CA	25	14	11	16	2	7
Medford, OR	24	21	3	12	11	7
Jackson, CA	30	18	12	21	7	--
Pittsford, VT	29	14	15	11	5	3
New Bedford, MA	19	10	9	21	10	9
Canastota, NY	18	7	11	20	3	9
Hempstead, NY	23	13	10	19	12	2
Port Allegheny, PA	29	12	17	18	--	3
Kansas City, MO	30	14	16	20	10	--
Cincinnati, OH	19	13	6	19	1	11
Warsaw, KY	26	21	5	20	1	3
Girard, KS	23	7	16	19	1	7
Grantsville, MD	21	10	11	14	14	10
Ft. Lauderdale, FL	24	24	--	11	--	1
Henryetta, OK	20	6	14	19	10	11
Houston, TX	29	26	3	13	2	2
Central City, CO	9	6	3	13	7	5
Taft, CA	30	20	10	11	9	1
Estacada, OR	28	21	7	17	10	3
Brockton, MA	22	7	15	11	8	3
Worchester, MA	20	3	17	13	10	--
Cherry Hill, NJ	21	6	15	17	--	--
Parsippany, NJ	22	12	10	10	10	4
Brooklyn, NY	31	16	15	12	10	2

TABLE A-6 (Continued)

	Congregate Participants					
	Total	Recent Entry	Longer Term	Non-Participating Neighbors	Home Delivered Meal Recipients	Former Participants
Lewes, DE	22	7	15	14	--	--
Pikesville, MD	30	16	14	14	--	1
Philadelphia, PA	24	9	15	12	9	2
Jensen Beach, FL	30	15	15	17	9	3
Brownsville, KY	24	3	21	14	9	3
Ledbetter, KY	10	3	7	8	1	2
Dunn, NC	30	10	20	15	10	5
Kenansville, NC	30	8	22	19	4	1
Old Hickory, TN	26	8	18	14	10	--
W. Frankfort, IL	20	10	10	11	7	2
Pinckney, MI	24	9	15	15	2	--
Detroit, MI	25	7	18	13	--	1
Anoka, MN	18	9	9	4	--	--
Akron, OH	20	10	10	18	10	2
Cleveland, OH	28	13	15	14	10	6
Wilton, WI	30	4	26	14	4	5
Westboro, WI	30	12	18	4	1	5
Des Arc, AR	30	8	22	16	7	4
Tularosa, NM	31	15	16	15	10	5
Austin, TX	22	8	14	13	2	1
Decatur, TX	27	12	15	16	6	4
LaMarque, TX	22	7	15	20	4	--
Persia, IA	30	5	25	14	10	6
Belleville, KS	30	15	15	18	10	2
Sterling, CO	27	12	15	13	2	1
Paso Robles, CA	30	7	23	11	10	4
Los Angeles, CA	30	15	15	15	10	2
Van Nuys, CA	26	3	23	9	10	--
Oakland, CA	29	14	15	18	7	1
North Bend, OR	8	--	8	--	9	--
TOTAL	1,735	857	878	1,039	415	249

The original design of the Longitudinal Evaluation of the Nutrition Services for the Elderly called for tracking and re-interviewing cohorts of elderly respondents each year over a period of several years. Despite the approximately six-year interval between Wave I and Wave II, it was desirable during Wave II to attempt to track and re-interview as many elderly interviewed in 1976 as possible. ORC attempted to track and re-interview a total of 1,716 elderly who had been congregate participants or non-participating neighbors. Tracking procedures employed at the 34 re-visited Wave I sites yielded an overall interview completion rate of 42 percent. (Table A-7 shows the Wave II disposition of tracked Wave I respondents.)

D. Sampling of Participants and Non-Participants

At each of the 70 sample locations, Site Interviewers were scheduled to complete the following number of interviews:

- 30 congregate meal site participants, and
- 20 non-participating neighbors

During interviewing, however, the scope of work was reduced. On the average, Site Interviewers completed 25 interviews with congregate dining participants and 15 interviews with non-participating neighbors.

At those sampled sites with home-delivered meals programs, Site Interviewers were originally scheduled to complete interviews with 10 home-delivered meal recipients. Fifty-seven of the 70 sample sites had attached Title III home-delivered meal programs, but because the size of site home-delivered programs varied considerably, 10 interviews were not possible at all locations. On the average, approximately 7 home-delivered meal recipient interviews were completed at each of 57 sites. Only one interview was conducted per household unless two elderly individuals residing in the same household were independently sampled by the procedures discussed below.

Procedures used to sample elderly participants and non-participants were designed to be both replicable and consistent with Wave I procedures. Sampling methods employed differed at revisited Wave I sites and sites sampled only during 1982, because substantial efforts were made to track and reinterview respondents from Wave I sites who were interviewed during

TABLE A-7

WAVE II DISPOSITION OF TRACKED WAVE I RESPONDENTS

	Wave I Status				
	Participants			Non-Participating Neighbors	Total
	Total	New	Long-term		
Wave II Disposition					
Not Living in Area					
Deceased	223 21%	142 21%	81 22%	103 15%	326 20%
Institutionalized	53 5%	33 5%	20 5%	16 2%	69 4%
Moved	67 6%	49 7%	18 5%	38 6%	105 6%
Lost Track	86 8%	60 9%	26 7%	94 14%	180 10%
Other	3 *%	3 *%	- 0%	7 1%	10 1%
Unable to Interview/ Successfully Tracked					
Refused	77 7%	55 8%	22 6%	82 12%	159 9%
Temporarily Out of Town	15 1%	9 1%	6 2%	13 2%	28 2%
Other	44 4%	30 4%	14 4%	27 4%	71 4%
Successfully Interviewed	450 43%	284 42%	166 45%	270 40%	720 42%
No Response	28 3%	10 1%	18 5%	20 3%	48 3%
TOTAL	1,046	675	371	670	1,716

*Denotes less than 1%.

1976-77. Because of these differences, sampling and other procedural details at revisited and newly sampled sites are discussed separately below.

1. Sampling at Revisited Sites (Pre-1975 Sites)

At each of the 34 revisited sample locations, first priority was given to tracking and scheduling for interview elderly who had been interviewed during Wave I. Tracking efforts occurred during the first 3-4 days of field activity at each site.

a. Congregate Meal Site Participants

Site interviewers first attempted to track Wave I respondents in the following manner:

1) Site or service provider records were consulted to update respondents' addresses and/or telephone numbers and, when possible, record their disposition (e.g. moved, deceased, etc.) from these records.

2) If a respondent was still living, according to site/service provider records, but there was no information regarding meal program status (i.e. active or not active), or their current telephone number, local telephone books were used to update the telephone number.

3) If no telephone listing could be found, or no site/service provider records were available, or the Site Interviewer was unable to contact the respondent the first time they visited the meal site, Site Interviewers were permitted to make one telephone call to the referral person extracted from the respondent's Wave I questionnaire or inquire about their status among current site participants.

4) Respondents who were ascertained to be living in the area or for whom a current telephone number was available were contacted by telephone. Site Interviewers made up to 4 total telephone attempts to reach a respondent and secure their cooperation in the study. If after 4 total attempts, respondents living in the area could not be reached, tracking procedures were terminated.

5) When Wave I congregate meal site participants were reached by telephone they were screened to determine their current program status.

Tracked respondents were classified into one of three groups:

1) Longer-Term Participants had eaten at the meal site within the last three months.

2) Home-Delivered Meal Recipients had received a home-delivered meal within the last three months.

3) Former Participants had neither eaten at the meal site nor received a home-delivered meal within the last three months.

Regardless of the current status of tracked respondents, successfully completed interviews with this group were applied against the site's target of 30 congregate dining participant interviews.

Supplemental samples of the most recent current congregate dining program entrants were drawn from each site/service provider's attendance records to achieve the target number of completed interviews. Sampling of this supplemental sample was executed as follows:

1) Lists of the most recent congregate meal sites were compiled from meal site/service provider records. When possible, most recent entrants were oversampled to minimize time spent with records.

2) Lists were worked in reverse chronological order by date of program entry, since it was desirable to obtain interviews with the most recent program entrants. To help meet this goal, lists were updated each Friday during the interviewing period. For each new entrant added, the participant who had entered least recently was deleted. Thus, Site Interviewers maintained a weekly updated sample of constant size.

3) Site Interviewers worked the sample lists top to bottom, interviewing the most recent entrants first so that the recent entrants added each Friday would have some experience with the program. Site Interviewers attempted to interview them after they had consumed 2 meals, but before they had attended 5 congregate site meals.

4) Each person in the sample received up to 4 telephone calls to secure cooperation. Some interviews were arranged by Site Interviewers if they meet individuals at the meal site during sampling and other activities.

All recent congregrate dining participants were administered the interview appropriate for Recent Entrants.

b. Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

Site Interviewers constructed samples of home-delivered meal recipients by consulting meal site/service provider records. Using an nth name selection procedure, home-delivered meal recipients were oversampled 2:1. Each member of the sample received up to 4 telephone calls to arrange an interview. An identical procedure was employed at sites sampled for the first time during Wave II.

c. Non-Participating Neighbors

Samples of non-participating neighbors consisted of tracked Wave I non-participating neighbors and supplemental samples of newly sampled non-participating neighbors during Wave II. Since tracking and reinterviewing elderly who were non-participating neighbors during Wave I was of primary importance, tracking was conducted first. Site Interviewers used the following tracking procedures:

1) An initial telephone call was made to contact the respondent. If contact was not made, Site Interviewers made one telephone call to the referral person extracted from the respondent's Wave I questionnaire to obtain a corrected telephone number or the respondent's disposition.

2) If a current telephone number was obtained, up to 3 additional calls were attempted to contact respondents and secure their cooperation. If 4 total attempts to directly reach the respondent failed, no further tracking efforts were made.

3) When Wave I non-participating neighbors were successfully contacted, they were screened to determine their current program status.

Tracked and successfully contacted Wave I non-participating neighbors who agreed to be interviewed were classified into one of four groups:

1) Non-Participating Neighbors had never eaten at a meal site nor received a home-delivered meal; or had never consumed more than 4 congregate or home-delivered meals.

2) Longer-Term Participants had eaten more than four congregate meals within the last three months.

3) Home-Delivered Meal Recipients had received more than four home-delivered meals during the last three months.

4) Former Participants had consumed more than four congregate meals, but longer than three months ago.

Regardless of their current program status, completed interviews with tracked non-participating neighbors were applied against the site's target of 20 non-participating neighbor interviews.

Supplemental samples of non-participating neighbors were also drawn by Site Interviewers when they were in the field conducting interviews with meal site participants. Starting indicators for this areal sample were the residences of meal site participants with whom interviews had been completed. Sampling followed these procedures:

1) Using a successfully interviewed congregate dining participants residence as the starting indicator, Site Interviewers faced the starting indicator and sampled every fifth housing unit to the left. Site Interviewers sampled a total of 6 housing units (30 units to the left of the starting indicator) at each starting indicator. A housing unit was defined as a house, an individual residence in a duplex, or an individual apartment in an apartment building. In urban areas, Site Interviewers worked one side of the street. However, when sampling in rural areas, both sides of the road were worked and when cross-roads were encountered, Site Interviewers took a right turn.

2) At each sampling point, an in-person attempt was made to ascertain whether any individual 60 years or older resided there. If Site Interviewers were unable to contact someone, they were required to make up to 3 callbacks to determine whether a qualified person resided at the sampled housing unit unless a neighbor could provide the information.

3) All persons residing in a sampled housing unit who were 60 years or older were screened to qualify or disqualify them as respondents. Qualified non-participating neighbors were classified as:

- Non-Participating Neighbors had neither consumed a congregate nor home-delivered meal, or had consumed four or less meals.
- Former Participants had eaten a congregate meal, but longer than three months ago.

4) In the event that more than one qualified elderly individual resided in a sampled housing unit, a single respondent was selected to be interviewed by referring to the respondent selection form in Figure A-8.

5) In order to ensure that interviews were distributed across all starting points at a given location, Site Interviewers conducted no more than 2 interviews associated with a single starting indicator unless other location starting indicators did not yield an adequate number of qualified elderly.

6) In rural areas, Site Interviewers proceeded no further than 3 miles from a starting indicator to sample 6 out of 30 housing units. This procedural guideline helped ensure that in sparsely populated areas, elderly from adjacent municipalities or political subdivisions with separate Title III services would not be sampled.

Overall, these procedures were designed to be as replicable as possible. These procedures represent an improvement upon procedures used to locate qualified non-participating neighbors during Wave I.

2. Sampling at Post-1975 Sites

Procedures employed to sample and interview elderly respondents at the 36 sites sampled for the first time during Wave II were somewhat simpler than sampling at the 34 revisited locations.

FIGURE A-8

RESPONDENT SELECTION FORM FOR
NEW SAMPLE OF NON-PARTICIPATING NEIGHBORS

List all adults 60 years and older in household. (List all men first, oldest to youngest; then all women, oldest to youngest. Use relationship to male head of household -- son, wife, cousin, etc.)

Resident Number	Relationship	Age
1	_____	_____
2	_____	_____
3	_____	_____
4	_____	_____
5	_____	_____
6	_____	_____

Number of Adults 60 Years or Older in Housing Unit

Housing Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6
5th	1	2	2	3[1]	4	3
10th	1	1	1	2	4	6
15th	1	1	3	2	5	4
20th	1	2	2	4	3	2
25th	1	1	3	1	2	1
30th	1	2	2	4	1	5

[1] If 4 qualified adults resided in the 5th housing unit from a completed participant interview, (i.e. 1st housing unit sampled), the 3rd person listed was interviewed.

a. Congregate Meal Site Participants

Each meal site's target of 30 completed interviews was equally divided, when feasible, between longer-term participants and recent entrants.

1) Longer-term participants were those elderly who had entered the program at least 18 months prior to the interviewing.

2) Recent entrants consisted of elderly who were a site's most recent entrants.

Sampling for both sub-populations was done by consulting site/service provider participant intake forms.

Using an nth name selection procedure, Site Interviewers oversampled longer-term participants by a 2:1 ratio. All longer-term participants interviewed received the interview designed specifically for them. The sample was randomly worked, with each person receiving up to 4 telephone attempts to secure an interview before being discarded from the sample.

Procedures used to sample and conduct interviews with the most recent entrants were identical to those employed when sampling the supplemental sample of most recent program entrants at revisited Wave I locations.

b. Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

Procedures employed to sample this group of elderly were identical to those used at revisited Wave I sites.

c. Non-Participating Neighbors

Sampling procedures were identical to those used when constructing the supplemental sample of non-tracked non-participating neighbors at the 34 revisited Wave I sites.

E. Verification of Interviews

Overall, ORC verified a random sample of 20% of all completed interviews at each site. This was accomplished in two phases. First, Site Interviewer field supervisors verified a random sample of 10% of their interviewer teams' interviews. Following this, an additional random sample of 10% of each site's interviews was verified by telephone by ORC's WATS Interviewing Department. During each phase of this quality control process, five key pieces of information were obtained: (1) that the individual had been interviewed, (2) that the interview had been conducted in person, (3) where the interview took place, (4) whether the 24-Hour Dietary Recall portion of the interview had been conducted, and (5) verification of the respondent's address.

F. Questionnaires[1]

Interviewing instruments used during Wave II were slightly modified versions of Wave I questionnaires and consisted primarily of closed-ended questions. For key items, questionnaire wording was retained so that Wave I - Wave II comparisons were possible. Below we describe the components of the questionnaires.

- Personal Experience With Nutrition Program

  This section queried respondents about attendance frequency, plans for future attendance, length of attendance, how elderly first learned of the services, problems getting to the site, and perceptions of donation/contributions policy.

[1] Copies of all instruments are contained in ORC Site Interviewer's Manual: Longitudinal Evaluation of Nutrition Services for the Elderly, Opinion Research Corporation, April, 1982.

- Personal Evaluation of Nutrition Program

  Respondents were asked if they were aware of site social activities, shopping assistance, medical assistance and whether they used these services. In addition, elderly rated the site in terms of its overall pleasantness, most and least liked attributes, food palatability, whether they had ever been denied service and whether the service saved them money.

- Personal Mobility

  This section assessed the degree to which respondents were able to get out of their homes and perform normal daily activities such as dressing themselves, maintenance and cleaning of their homes, washing and bathing, etc.

- Health

  Elderly self-reported health status was gathered by questions in this component of the interview: number of doctor visits, time in bed due to illness, use of aids (e.g. canes, etc.), self-rated eyesight and hearing, overall self-rated health, and health relative to last year.

- Eating Habits

  Respondents were queried regarding their typical eating habits, e.g. eating enjoyment, eating alone, ability to prepare meals for themselves, awareness and utilization of nutrition education activities at the congregate meal sites.

- Psychological Well-Being

  This section posed questions concerning whether elderly were looking forward to something particular next week, whether they had enough friends, if they had a confidante and asked them to state how often they had experienced various affective states during the past few weeks (e.g. depression, loneliness).

- Social Life

  Questions were designed to assess how socially active or isolated respondents were, i.e. whether and how frequently they attended religious activities, membership in clubs or other organizations, how long ago their children had last visited them.

- Income Sufficiency

  Several questions were posed regarding current weekly household expenditure for food, how well respondents felt the amount of money they had took care of their needs, whether they had enough money for "extras," and whether they supported others.

- Demographics

  This section assessed standard demographic characteristics: marital status, age, education, whether elderly lived alone, whether parents were living, income, use of foodstamps and Medicaid, receipt of rent assistance.

- Friend/Relative Location

  Each respondent was asked to provide the name, address, and telephone number of a person who would know where the respondent lived should respondents move.

- 24-Hour Dietary Recall

The major portion of this section consisted of one lengthy open-ended question designed to measure the foods elderly had consumed during the previous 24 hours. Respondents were asked to list specific foods, and with the aid of Site Interviewers, used templates and serving cups to estimate portion sizes for food consumed during three periods: Midnight - 11:00 AM; 11:00 AM - 4:00 PM; and 4:00 PM - Midnight. Interviewers recorded specific foods and portion sizes on a list of 125 pre-coded foods. Further details regarding the administration of the 24-Hour Dietary Recall are contained in the next section of the Methodology.

Following the 24-Hour Dietary Recall, elderly were also asked whether they had consumed a nutrition service meal yesterday so that comparisons could be made between those whose dietary intake reflected a nutrition service meal and those whose did not.

- Interviewer Observations

The final section of each questionnaire asked Site Interviewers to record a number of observations regarding the person interviewed: whether respondents were realistically oriented, cooperative, and whether they had difficulty comprehending questions or seemed unable to read.

Additional demographic information was also recorded: respondent's gender, race, whether respondents were Spanish speaking and the type of area in which elderly resided (i.e. type of dwelling, estimated age of dwelling, type of area - center city, suburb, etc.)

G. Site Interviewer Training

ORC professional staff conducted two day training sessions for Site Interviewers at 11 locations throughout the U.S. from May 10 - May 27, 1983. The majority of Site Interviewers were female over 30 years of age and many had been ORC Site Interviewers for Wave I. Table A-9 lists training locations, training dates, and the sample locations corresponding to each training session. At each location, ORC's training staff consisted of two ORC professional staff and a graduate student in nutrition whose primary role was training Site Interviewers to administer the 24-Hour Dietary Recall. All ORC training staff and nutrition consultants were present at the initial training session held in Princeton, New Jersey. Each training session was divided into two components: Day 1 and Day 2.

1. Day 1

The first day of training was devoted to familiarizing Site Interviewers with study background and objectives. General procedures, ethics, and guidelines for conducting personal interviews in a non-biasing manner were discussed and the importance of confidentiality was reinforced. Additionally, Site Interviewers were trained to administer each of the versions of the questionnaire through a question-by-question review of the instruments. Sampling and tracking procedures and weekly field reporting requirements were covered during Day 1 and Day 2.

2. Day 2: 24-Hour Dietary Recall

The second day of training was devoted almost exclusively to administration of the 24-Hour Dietary Recall. During the morning, the purpose of the instrument was reviewed, the instrument was reviewed food item by food item, Site Interviewers observed a mock interview and were asked to record responses during this mock interview. Each Site Interviewer's coding of the mock interview was reviewed and coding instructions were clarified and problems of interpretation resolved.

TABLE A-9

ORC SITE INTERVIEWER TRAINING SCHEDULE

Date	Training Location	Site
May 10-11	Princeton, NJ	Lakewood, NJ Grantsville, MD Cherry Hill, NJ Parsippany, NJ Lewes, DE Pikesville, MD Philadelphia, PA
May 17-18	New York, NY	Watertown, NY McAlisterville, PA Pittsford, VT New Bedford, MA Canastota, NY Hempstead, NY Port Allegheny, PA Brockton, MA Worcester, MA Brooklyn, NY
May 20-21	San Francisco, CA	Auberry, CA Jackson, CA Oakland, CA
May 20-21	Oklahoma City, OK	Henryetta, OK Central City, CO Des Arc, AR Sterling, CO
May 20-21	Kansas City, KS	Leavenworth, KS Lincoln, NE Kansas City, MO Girard, KS Persia, IA Belleville, KS
May 24-25	Portland, OR	Medford, OR Estacada, OR North Bend, OR

TABLE A-9 (Continued)

Date	Training Location	Site
May 24-25	Houston, TX	San Ygnacio, TX San Antonio, TX Houston, TX Tularosa, NM Austin, TX Decatur, TX LaMarque, TX
May 24-25	Detroit, MI	Trenton, MI Canton, OH Waupun, WI Cincinnati, OH Warsaw, KY Pinckney, MI Detroit, MI Akron, OH Cleveland, OH Westboro, WI
May 26-27	Los Angeles, CA	Taft, CA Paso Robles, CA Los Angeles, CA Van Nuys, CA
May 26-27	Atlanta, GA	Childersburg, AL Douglasville, GA Lenoir, NC Ft. Lauderdale, FL Jensen Beach, FL Brownsville, KY Ledbetter, KY Dunn, NC Kenansville, NC Old Hickory, TN
May 26-27	Chicago, IL	Metropolis, IL Chicago, IL Kingsport, TN W. Frankford, IL Anoka, MN Wilton, WI

Following this, Site Interviewers were introduced to the Portion Size Kits which consisted of equipment that could be used for determining portion sizes:

8 ounce glass
12 ounce glass
2 cup measuring cup
A nest of measuring cups with
    1/4, 1/3, 1/2, and 1 cup sizes
1 bowl (equals 2 cups)
2 cups Minute Rice in a sealed container
1 paper plate
Cardboard cut-outs of bottles, cake-slices,
    pie slices, pizza slices of different shapes
A nest of measuring spoons with
    1 tablespoon, and 1/4, 1/2, and 1 teaspoon sizes
A 6-inch plastic ruler
A wooden gauge to measure meat and other food portion
    thickness

Site Interviewers conducted mock interviews with their colleagues. Coding of novel regional foods, problems in measuring portion sizes, and how to correctly record mixed dishes were discussed.

For further information regarding this phase of Site Interviewer training, please refer to the ORC Site Interviewer's Manual.

APPENDIX A[1]

DETAILED TABULATIONS:

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Question I5	Age of Respondent	A-2
Question L7	Sex of Respondent	A-3
Question I1	Marital Status	A-4
Question I4	Respondent Lives Alone	A-5
Question L8	Minority Status	A-6
Question I9	1981 Family Income	A-7
Question H2	Income Sufficiency	A-8
Question I10	Receiving Food Stamps	A-9
Question I11	Receiving Medicaid Benefits	A-10
Question I12	Receiving Rent Assistance	A-11

---

[1] Tables in this appendix include distributions for all elderly sub-populations: TRAC refers to tracked Wave I respondents; NTRAC refers to non-tracked elderly; NEWER and OLDER sites were established post-1975 and pre-1975, respectively.

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION 15

AGE

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
UNDER 65	224	127	97	5	92	176	48	148	90	58	2	56	32	7	411
	13%	14%	12%	2%	17%	20%	5%	14%	19%	10%	1%	16%	8%	3%	12%
65 - 69	379	211	168	39	129	203	176	248	127	121	42	79	40	38	705
	22%	24%	20%	14%	23%	24%	20%	24%	27%	21%	19%	23%	10%	15%	21%
70 - 74	415	218	197	73	124	185	230	224	95	129	65	64	63	57	759
	24%	24%	24%	26%	22%	22%	26%	22%	20%	23%	30%	18%	15%	23%	22%
75 - 79	371	190	181	79	102	147	224	211	87	124	48	76	88	78	748
	21%	21%	22%	29%	19%	17%	26%	20%	19%	22%	22%	22%	21%	31%	22%
80 AND OVER	342	155	187	81	106	143	199	204	71	133	59	74	189	68	803
	20%	17%	22%	29%	19%	17%	23%	20%	15%	24%	27%	21%	46%	27%	23%
REFUSED	3	1	2	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	*
NO RESPONSE	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	1	1	2	1	8
	*	*	0	0	0	0	*	*	*	*	1%	*	*	1%	*
MEAN	73.0	72.5	73.5	76.3	72.2	71.3	74.6	72.7	71.5	73.8	75.6	72.7	78.0	75.9	73.7

SECTION L: INTERVIEWER'S OBSERVATIONS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION L7

SEX OF RESPONDENT

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
MALE	473	259	214	62	152	244	229	329	157	172	72	100	117	48	967
	27%	29%	26%	22%	27%	29%	26%	32%	33%	30%	33%	28%	28%	19%	28%
FEMALE	1256	641	615	215	400	610	646	706	313	393	145	248	296	200	2458
	73%	71%	74%	78%	72%	71%	74%	68%	66%	69%	67%	71%	71%	80%	72%
NO RESPONSE	6	3	3	0	3	3	3	4	2	2	0	2	2	1	13
	*	*	*	0	1%	*	*	*	1%	1%	0	1%	1%	1%	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION 11

MARITAL STATUS

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
MARRIED	596	328	268	91	177	296	300	450	214	236	100	136	119	75	1240
	34%	36%	32%	33%	32%	35%	34%	43%	45%	42%	46%	39%	28%	30%	36%
DIVORCED	114	59	55	8	47	75	39	49	25	24	7	17	24	17	204
	7%	7%	7%	3%	8%	9%	4%	5%	5%	4%	3%	5%	6%	7%	6%
SEPARATED	36	19	17	1	16	26	10	14	8	6	0	6	8	3	61
	2%	2%	2%	*	3%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0	2%	2%	1%	2%
WIDOWED	910	446	464	166	298	430	480	484	204	280	103	177	236	143	1773
	52%	49%	56%	60%	54%	50%	55%	47%	43%	49%	48%	50%	57%	58%	51%
NEVER MARRIED	79	51	28	11	17	30	49	42	21	21	7	14	28	10	159
	5%	6%	3%	4%	3%	3%	6%	4%	5%	4%	3%	4%	7%	4%	5%
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION 14

LIVE ALONE

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HOM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
ALONE	952	481	471	164	307	453	499	474	206	268	87	181	252	137	1815
	55%	53%	57%	59%	55%	53%	57%	46%	44%	47%	40%	52%	61%	55%	53%
WITH SOMEONE	778	418	360	113	247	402	376	563	266	297	130	167	163	112	1616
	45%	46%	43%	41%	45%	47%	43%	54%	56%	53%	60%	48%	39%	45%	47%
NO RESPONSE	5	4	1	0	1	2	3	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	7
	*	1%	*	0	*	*	*	*	0	*	0	0	0	0	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION L: INTERVIEWER'S OBSERVATIONS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION L8

RACE OF RESPONDENT

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
HISPANIC	72	26	46	9	37	37	35	20	8	12	5	7	17	6	115
	4%	3%	6%	3%	7%	4%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	2%	3%
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	7	1	6	5	1	0	7	2	0	2	1	1	2	0	11
	1%	*	1%	2%	*	0	1%	*	0	*	*	1%	*	0	*
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
	*	*	0	0	0	0	*	*	1%	0	0	0	0	0	*
BLACK, NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	241	175	66	25	41	120	121	157	91	66	30	36	45	30	473
	14%	19%	8%	9%	7%	14%	14%	15%	19%	12%	14%	10%	11%	12%	14%
WHITE, NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	1407	696	711	238	473	697	710	847	366	481	179	302	347	213	2814
	81%	77%	85%	86%	85%	81%	81%	82%	77%	85%	83%	86%	84%	86%	82%
NO RESPONSE	7	4	3	0	3	3	4	10	4	6	2	4	4	0	21
	*	1%	*	0	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION 19B

REPORTED AND ESTIMATED 1981 INCOME

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDH	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
UNDER $2,000 A YEAR	56	26	30	8	22	33	23	32	16	16	3	13	28	11	127
	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%	4%	7%	5%	4%
$2,000 - $3,999	396	212	184	69	115	169	227	220	98	122	50	72	129	76	821
	23%	23%	22%	25%	21%	20%	26%	21%	21%	22%	23%	21%	31%	31%	24%
$4,000 - $5,999	449	231	218	74	144	221	228	226	99	127	53	74	110	65	850
	26%	26%	26%	27%	26%	26%	26%	22%	21%	22%	25%	21%	27%	26%	25%
$6,000 - $9,999	404	187	217	72	145	208	196	232	100	132	52	80	99	45	780
	23%	21%	26%	26%	26%	24%	22%	22%	21%	23%	24%	23%	24%	18%	23%
$10,000 - $13,999	175	99	76	24	52	85	90	134	59	75	34	41	20	28	357
	10%	11%	9%	8%	9%	10%	10%	13%	13%	13%	16%	12%	5%	11%	10%
$14,000 - $17,999	102	60	42	13	29	58	44	58	31	27	8	19	6	10	176
	6%	7%	5%	5%	5%	7%	5%	6%	7%	5%	4%	5%	1%	4%	5%
$18,000 - $21,999	33	19	14	4	10	17	16	34	21	13	5	8	2	3	72
	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	2%	2%	*	1%	2%
$22,000 OR OVER	45	29	16	2	14	30	15	57	33	24	3	21	6	6	114
	3%	3%	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%	6%	7%	4%	1%	6%	1%	2%	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED/NO RESPONSE	75	40	35	11	24	36	39	46	15	31	9	22	15	5	141
	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	6%	4%	6%	4%	2%	4%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION H: INCOME SUFFICIENCY

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION H2

INCOME SUFFICIENCY

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
VERY WELL	578	293	285	109	176	273	305	368	164	204	86	118	87	86	1119
	34%	33%	34%	39%	32%	32%	35%	35%	35%	36%	40%	34%	21%	35%	33%
FAIRLY WELL	905	471	434	140	294	446	459	505	214	291	106	185	230	120	1760
	52%	52%	52%	51%	53%	52%	52%	49%	45%	51%	49%	53%	55%	48%	51%
POORLY	228	127	101	25	76	126	102	149	81	68	25	43	87	41	505
	13%	14%	12%	9%	14%	15%	12%	14%	17%	12%	11%	12%	21%	16%	15%
DON'T KNOW	19	10	9	2	7	11	8	15	11	4	0	4	9	0	43
	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	0	1%	2%	0	1%
NO RESPONSE	5	2	3	1	2	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	11
	*	*	1%	*	*	*	*	*	1%	0	0	0	1%	1%	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION 110

USE OF FOOD STAMPS

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
YES, I AM	191	90	101	35	66	96	95	97	48	49	15	34	69	28	385
	11%	10%	12%	12%	12%	11%	11%	9%	10%	9%	7%	10%	17%	11%	11%
YES, SPOUSE	2	1	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	1	5
	*	*	*	0	*	0	*	*	0	*	1%	0	0	1%	*
YES, BOTH	24	10	14	2	12	16	8	10	7	3	3	0	10	4	48
	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0	2%	2%	2%
NO	1513	800	713	240	473	740	773	930	417	513	197	316	335	215	2993
	87%	89%	86%	87%	85%	86%	88%	90%	88%	90%	91%	90%	81%	86%	87%
DON'T KNOW	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	*	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	*
NO RESPONSE	4	1	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6
	*	*	*	0	1%	1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	*	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION 111

RECEIPT OF MEDICAID

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
YES, I AM	282	153	129	47	82	121	161	127	64	63	19	44	104	41	554
	16%	17%	16%	17%	15%	14%	18%	12%	14%	11%	9%	12%	25%	17%	16%
YES, SPOUSE	6	2	4	3	1	2	4	9	7	2	2	0	7	1	23
	*	*	*	1%	*	*	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	0	2%	*	1%
YES, BOTH	38	21	17	6	11	18	20	23	12	11	4	7	12	7	80
	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%
NO	1391	717	674	219	455	707	684	869	385	484	187	297	280	197	2737
	80%	79%	81%	79%	82%	83%	78%	84%	82%	86%	86%	85%	67%	79%	80%
DON'T KNOW	11	6	5	2	3	5	6	11	4	7	5	2	10	2	34
	1%	1%	1%	1%	0	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%
NO RESPONSE	7	4	3	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	10
	1%	1%	*	0	1%	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	1%	*	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION I12

RENTAL ASSISTANCE (ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO RENT A HOME OR APARTMENT)

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
PERCENT ASKED	590	321	269	88	181	287	303	372	191	181	46	135	180	98	1240
	34%	36%	32%	32%	33%	33%	35%	36%	40%	32%	21%	39%	43%	39%	36%
MONEY	14	8	6	1	5	6	8	8	4	4	0	4	3	1	26
	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0	1%	1%	*	1%
LOWER RENT	174	82	92	29	63	85	89	141	58	83	18	65	48	40	403
	10%	9%	11%	10%	11%	10%	10%	14%	12%	15%	8%	19%	12%	16%	12%
OTHER	6	2	4	2	2	2	4	8	5	3	1	2	6	0	20
	*	*	*	1%	*	*	*	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	0	1%
NO	362	212	150	50	100	175	187	201	117	84	25	59	108	56	727
	21%	23%	18%	18%	18%	20%	21%	19%	25%	15%	12%	17%	26%	22%	21%
DON'T KNOW	10	7	3	3	0	5	5	4	4	0	0	0	5	0	19
	1%	1%	*	1%	0	1%	1%	*	1%	0	0	0	1%	0	1%
NO RESPONSE	24	10	14	3	11	14	10	10	3	7	2	5	10	1	45
	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	*	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX B[1]

DETAILED TABULATIONS:

MOBILITY AND HEALTH CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Question C1	Frequency of Getting Out of the House	B-2
Question C4	Difficulty Going Out of Doors	B-3
Question C3	Can Clean/Maintain House/Apartment	B-4
Question D1-D2	Number of Visits to a Doctor Other Than For a Check-up or Physical	B-5
Question D4	Time in Hospital or Nursing Home in Past Year	B-6
Question D6	Self-rating of Eyesight	B-7
Question D7	Self-rating of Hearing	B-8
Question D12	Self-rated Current Health	B-9
Question D13	Health Relative to Last Year's	B-10

---

[1] Tables in this appendix include distributions for all elderly sub-populations: TRAC refers to tracked Wave I respondents; NTRAC refers to non-tracked elderly; NEWER and OLDER sites were established post-1975 and pre-1975, respectively.

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION C: PERSONAL MOBILITY

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION C1

FREQUENCY OF GETTING OUT OF THE HOUSE

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
NEARLY EVERY DAY	1405	730	675	232	443	681	724	707	330	377	134	243	101	158	2371
	81%	81%	81%	84%	80%	79%	82%	68%	70%	67%	62%	69%	24%	63%	69%
EVERY OTHER DAY	165	83	82	22	60	88	77	105	40	65	23	42	20	28	318
	9%	9%	10%	8%	11%	10%	9%	10%	9%	11%	11%	12%	5%	11%	9%
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	116	60	56	19	37	65	51	142	63	79	38	41	94	37	389
	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	8%	6%	14%	13%	14%	17%	12%	23%	15%	11%
LESS THAN ONCE A WEEK	33	20	13	3	10	14	19	62	24	38	16	22	108	19	222
	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	6%	5%	7%	7%	6%	26%	8%	7%
OTHER	14	10	4	1	3	7	7	21	13	8	6	2	89	7	131
	1%	1%	*	*	0	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	3%	1%	21%	3%	4%
DON'T KNOW	2	0	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	7
	*	0	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	0	0	0	1%	0	*
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION C: PERSONAL MOBILITY

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION C4

DIFFICULTY GOING OUT OF DOORS ...

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
NO DIFFICULTY AND WITHOUT HELP	1566	806	760	246	514	784	782	871	398	473	175	298	121	196	2754
	90%	89%	91%	89%	93%	92%	89%	84%	84%	83%	81%	85%	29%	79%	80%
SOME DIFFICULTY BUT WITHOUT HELP OF ANOTHER PERSON	136	79	57	25	32	55	81	114	52	62	29	33	136	37	423
	8%	9%	7%	9%	6%	6%	9%	11%	11%	11%	13%	10%	33%	15%	12%
WITH DIFFICULTY AND ONLY WITH HELP OF ANOTHER PERSON	29	16	13	6	7	15	14	51	20	31	13	18	154	16	250
	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	5%	4%	6%	6%	5%	37%	6%	7%
NO RESPONSE	4	2	2	0	2	3	1	3	2	1	0	1	4	0	11
	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	*	1%	*	0	*	1%	0	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION C: PERSONAL MOBILITY

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION C3

CLEAN/MAINTAIN HOUSE/APARTMENT

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
YES	1548	805	743	247	496	761	787	885	402	483	176	307	172	204	2809
	89%	89%	89%	89%	89%	89%	90%	85%	85%	85%	81%	88%	41%	82%	82%
NO	167	84	83	30	53	87	80	138	58	80	40	40	238	44	587
	10%	9%	10%	11%	10%	10%	9%	13%	12%	14%	18%	11%	57%	18%	17%
DON'T KNOW	6	4	2	0	2	5	1	7	5	2	1	1	3	1	17
	*	1%	*	0	*	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	*	*
NO RESPONSE	14	10	4	0	4	4	10	9	7	2	0	2	2	0	25
	1%	1%	1%	0	1%	*	1%	1%	2%	*	0	1%	1%	0	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION D: HEALTH

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION D1 MINUS D2

NUMBER OF VISITS TO A DOCTOR OTHER THAN FOR A CHECK-UP OR PHYSICAL EXAMINATION

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
NONE	879	447	432	152	280	445	434	575	259	316	118	198	190	122	1766
	51%	50%	52%	55%	50%	52%	49%	55%	55%	56%	54%	57%	46%	49%	51%
1 - 2 TIMES	312	164	148	56	92	135	177	163	86	77	30	47	56	41	572
	18%	18%	18%	20%	17%	16%	20%	16%	18%	14%	14%	13%	13%	16%	17%
3 - 5 TIMES	225	118	107	27	80	105	120	125	51	74	29	45	42	33	425
	13%	13%	13%	10%	14%	12%	14%	12%	11%	13%	13%	13%	10%	13%	12%
6 - 10 TIMES	141	86	55	16	39	68	73	65	29	36	20	16	40	20	266
	8%	10%	7%	6%	7%	8%	8%	6%	6%	6%	9%	5%	10%	8%	8%
11 - 15 TIMES	90	40	50	17	33	51	39	47	15	32	11	21	28	19	184
	5%	4%	6%	6%	6%	6%	4%	5%	3%	6%	5%	6%	7%	8%	5%
16 - 20 TIMES	14	10	4	2	2	4	10	14	10	4	0	4	13	5	46
	1%	1%	*	1%	*	*	1%	1%	2%	1%	0	1%	3%	2%	1%
MORE THAN 20 TIMES	48	25	23	6	17	31	17	29	12	17	5	12	29	5	111
	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	4%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	7%	2%	3%
MEAN	3.2	3.4	3.0	2.4	3.3	3.5	2.9	2.9	2.5	3.3	2.7	3.6	5.0	3.1	3.3

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

SECTION D: HEALTH

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION D4

TIME IN HOSPITAL OR NURSING HOME IN PAST YEAR

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
NONE	1325	694	631	207	424	649	676	794	370	424	165	259	224	167	2510
	76%	77%	76%	75%	77%	76%	77%	76%	78%	75%	76%	74%	54%	67%	73%
A WEEK OR LESS	173	92	81	32	49	79	94	93	37	56	22	34	38	32	336
	10%	10%	10%	11%	9%	9%	11%	9%	8%	10%	10%	10%	9%	13%	10%
MORE THAN A WEEK BUT LESS THAN ONE MONTH	173	83	90	27	63	96	77	104	44	60	23	37	91	34	402
	10%	9%	11%	10%	11%	11%	9%	10%	9%	11%	11%	10%	22%	14%	12%
1 - 3 MONTHS	50	27	23	8	15	25	25	39	17	22	5	17	37	15	141
	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	2%	5%	9%	6%	4%
4 - 6 MONTHS	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	3	1	2	10	0	18
	*	*	0	0	0	*	*	1%	1%	0	1%	1%	2%	0	1%
7 - 9 MONTHS	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5
	*	*	0	0	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	*
10 MONTHS OR MORE	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	5
	*	0	*	0	*	*	0	*	*	0	0	0	1%	0	*
CANNOT RECALL	7	3	4	3	1	2	5	1	0	1	1	0	8	1	17
	1%	1%	*	1%	*	*	0	*	0	*	*	0	2%	*	*
NO RESPONSE	2	0	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	4
	*	0	*	0	*	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	*	0	*

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION D: HEALTH

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION D6

SELF-RATING OF EYESIGHT

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
EXCELLENT	155	72	83	28	55	76	79	87	34	53	24	29	11	15	268
	9%	8%	10%	10%	10%	9%	9%	8%	7%	9%	11%	8%	3%	6%	8%
GOOD	743	361	382	125	257	380	363	477	214	263	89	174	101	103	1424
	43%	40%	46%	45%	46%	44%	41%	46%	45%	47%	41%	50%	24%	41%	41%
FAIR	585	324	261	86	175	288	297	309	144	165	66	99	140	74	1108
	34%	36%	31%	31%	32%	34%	34%	30%	31%	29%	30%	28%	34%	30%	32%
POOR	251	145	106	38	68	113	138	165	79	86	38	48	162	57	635
	14%	16%	13%	14%	12%	13%	16%	16%	17%	15%	18%	14%	39%	23%	19%
DON'T KNOW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	*
NO RESPONSE	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
	*	*	0	0	0	0	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION D: HEALTH

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION D7

SELF-RATING OF HEARING

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
EXCELLENT	264	133	131	38	93	148	116	161	68	93	33	60	44	39	508
	15%	15%	16%	14%	17%	17%	13%	16%	14%	16%	15%	17%	11%	16%	15%
GOOD	843	435	408	132	276	426	417	527	246	281	102	179	179	112	1661
	49%	48%	49%	47%	50%	50%	48%	51%	52%	50%	47%	51%	43%	45%	48%
FAIR	472	252	220	80	140	215	257	253	113	140	59	81	113	65	903
	27%	28%	26%	29%	25%	25%	29%	24%	24%	25%	27%	23%	27%	26%	26%
POOR	156	83	73	27	46	68	88	98	45	53	23	30	79	33	366
	9%	9%	9%	10%	8%	8%	10%	9%	10%	9%	11%	9%	19%	13%	11%
DON'T KNOW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION D: HEALTH

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION D12

SELF-RATED CURRENT HEALTH

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
EXCELLENT	220	110	110	35	75	110	110	131	61	70	27	43	6	29	386
	13%	12%	13%	13%	13%	13%	12%	13%	13%	12%	12%	12%	2%	12%	11%
GOOD	693	339	354	129	225	339	354	411	191	220	75	145	83	93	1280
	40%	37%	43%	47%	40%	40%	40%	40%	41%	39%	35%	41%	20%	37%	37%
AVERAGE	380	200	180	60	120	182	198	196	82	114	47	67	76	50	702
	22%	22%	22%	22%	22%	21%	23%	19%	17%	20%	22%	19%	18%	20%	20%
FAIR	345	195	150	40	110	182	163	202	91	111	44	67	122	49	718
	20%	22%	18%	14%	20%	21%	19%	19%	19%	20%	20%	19%	29%	20%	21%
POOR	82	51	31	11	20	41	41	92	43	49	23	26	123	28	325
	5%	6%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	9%	9%	9%	11%	8%	30%	11%	10%
CAN'T SAY/DON'T KNOW	7	3	4	1	3	3	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
	*	*	*	*	1%	*	*	*	1%	0	0	0	0	0	*
NO RESPONSE	8	5	3	1	2	0	8	4	1	3	1	2	5	0	17
	*	1%	*	*	*	0	1%	*	*	0	*	1%	1%	0	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION D: HEALTH

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION D13

HEALTH RELATIVE TO LAST YEAR'S

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
BETTER	337	163	174	61	113	174	163	162	78	84	27	57	73	50	622
	19%	18%	21%	22%	20%	20%	19%	16%	16%	15%	13%	16%	18%	20%	18%
ABOUT THE SAME	1120	588	532	179	353	548	572	684	305	379	146	233	181	138	2123
	65%	65%	64%	65%	64%	64%	65%	66%	65%	67%	67%	67%	44%	55%	62%
WORSE	269	148	121	36	85	131	138	169	75	94	39	55	159	59	656
	16%	17%	15%	13%	15%	15%	16%	16%	16%	16%	18%	16%	38%	24%	19%
CAN'T SAY/DON'T KNOW	7	3	4	1	3	4	3	6	5	1	0	1	1	0	14
	*	*	*	*	1%	1%	*	0	1%	*	0	*	*	0	*
NO RESPONSE	2	1	1	0	1	0	2	18	9	9	5	4	1	2	23
	*	*	*	0	*	0	*	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	*	1%	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX C[1]

DETAILED TABULATIONS:

LIFESTYLE, DIETARY, AND AFFECTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Question E1	Presence of Others When Eating at Home	C-2
Question E5	Ability to Prepare Hot Meals (At Home)	C-3
Question E9	Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten	C-4
Question G1	Attendance at Religious Services	C-5
Question G6	Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Organizations	C-6
Question F9E	Frequency of Feeling Depressed or Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks	C-7
Question G9	Last Time Saw (Own) Children	C-8
Question F6	Number of Friends	C-9
Question F9H	Frequency of Feeling Lonely or Remote From Other People During Past Few Weeks	C-10

---

[1] Tables in this appendix include distributions for all elderly sub-populations: TRAC refers to tracked Wave I respondents; NTRAC refers to non-tracked elderly; NEWER and OLDER sites were established post-1975 and pre-1975, respectively.

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION E: EATING HABITS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION E1

PRESENCE OF OTHERS WHEN EATING AT HOME

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
BY SELF	1002	520	482	166	316	486	516	487	211	276	89	187	269	136	1894
	58%	58%	58%	60%	57%	57%	59%	47%	45%	49%	41%	53%	65%	55%	55%
WITH OTHERS	729	382	347	109	238	369	360	551	261	290	127	163	148	113	1541
	42%	42%	42%	39%	43%	43%	41%	53%	55%	51%	59%	47%	36%	45%	45%
DON'T KNOW	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
	*	0	*	1%	0	0	*	*	0	*	*	0	0	0	*
NO RESPONSE	3	1	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION E: EATING HABITS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION E5

ABILITY TO PREPARE HOT MEALS (ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO DO NOT PREPARE THEIR OWN MEALS)

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
PERCENT ASKED	357	185	172	52	120	188	169	285	133	152	68	84	161	46	849
	21%	20%	21%	19%	22%	22%	19%	27%	28%	27%	31%	24%	39%	18%	25%
YES	279	146	133	42	91	141	138	232	106	126	57	69	41	33	585
	16%	16%	16%	15%	16%	16%	16%	22%	22%	22%	26%	20%	10%	13%	17%
NO	65	35	30	8	22	40	25	47	24	23	11	12	106	9	227
	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	5%	3%	5%	5%	4%	5%	3%	26%	4%	7%
DON'T KNOW	6	2	4	1	3	3	3	3	2	1	0	1	5	4	18
	*	*	*	*	1%	*	*	*	*	*	0	*	1%	2%	1%
NO RESPONSE	7	2	5	1	4	4	3	3	1	2	0	2	9	0	19
	*	*	1%	*	1%	*	*	*	*	*	0	1%	2%	0	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION E: EATING HABITS

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION E9

NUTRITIOUSNESS OF MEALS GENERALLY EATEN

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
VERY NUTRITIOUS	1033	530	503	182	321	502	531	612	268	344	143	201	145	153	1943
	60%	59%	61%	66%	58%	59%	61%	59%	57%	61%	66%	57%	35%	62%	57%
FAIRLY NUTRITIOUS	615	329	286	80	206	316	299	361	174	187	64	123	231	83	1290
	35%	36%	34%	29%	37%	37%	34%	35%	37%	33%	30%	35%	56%	33%	38%
NOT TOO NUTRITIOUS	64	30	34	9	25	30	34	40	13	27	8	19	29	10	143
	4%	3%	4%	3%	5%	3%	4%	4%	3%	5%	4%	5%	7%	4%	4%
NO OPINION	3	2	1	0	1	1	2	4	1	3	1	2	4	3	14
	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	*	*	0	*	1%	1%	1%	*
DON'T KNOW	16	8	8	6	2	6	10	21	15	6	1	5	6	0	43
	1%	1%	1%	2%	*	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	*	2%	1%	0	1%
NO RESPONSE	4	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
	*	1%	0	0	0	*	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION G: SOCIAL LIFE

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION G1/HG1

ATTENDANCE AT RELIGIOUS SERVICES

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK	374	192	182	64	118	184	190	149	62	87	35	52	18	44	585
	21%	21%	22%	23%	21%	22%	22%	14%	13%	15%	16%	15%	4%	18%	17%
ONCE A WEEK	716	372	344	137	207	322	394	322	150	172	65	107	49	88	1175
	41%	41%	41%	50%	37%	38%	45%	31%	32%	30%	30%	31%	12%	35%	34%
ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH	168	83	85	26	59	97	71	90	54	36	13	23	25	18	301
	10%	9%	10%	9%	11%	11%	8%	9%	11%	7%	6%	7%	6%	7%	9%
LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH	67	41	26	9	17	27	40	57	28	29	11	18	19	14	157
	4%	5%	3%	3%	3%	3%	5%	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	5%
RARELY	170	100	70	21	49	87	83	157	67	90	37	53	63	38	428
	10%	11%	9%	8%	9%	10%	9%	15%	14%	16%	17%	15%	15%	15%	12%
NEVER	239	115	124	20	104	140	99	263	111	152	56	96	241	46	789
	14%	13%	15%	7%	19%	16%	11%	25%	24%	27%	26%	27%	58%	19%	23%
NO RESPONSE	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3
	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION G: SOCIAL LIFE

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION G6/HG6

MEMBERSHIP IN CLUBS, LODGES, OR OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
YES	801	432	369	142	227	357	444	312	128	184	79	105	86	113	1312
	46%	48%	44%	51%	41%	42%	51%	30%	27%	33%	36%	30%	21%	45%	38%
NO	927	470	457	134	323	495	432	705	331	374	133	241	327	134	2093
	54%	52%	55%	49%	58%	58%	49%	68%	70%	66%	61%	69%	79%	54%	61%
DON'T KNOW	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	5
	*	0	*	0	*	*	0	*	0	*	1%	0	*	1%	*
NO RESPONSE	6	1	5	1	4	4	2	21	13	8	4	4	0	1	28
	*	*	1%	*	1%	*	*	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	0	*	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION F: PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION F9E

FREQUENCY OF FEELING ...

E. DEPRESSED OR VERY UNHAPPY DURING PAST FEW WEEKS

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
OFTEN (1)	94	52	42	10	32	52	42	61	33	28	8	20	61	14	230
	5%	6%	5%	4%	6%	6%	5%	6%	7%	5%	4%	6%	15%	6%	7%
SOMETIMES (2)	394	203	191	59	132	205	189	219	97	122	42	80	139	70	822
	23%	22%	23%	21%	24%	24%	21%	21%	21%	22%	19%	23%	33%	28%	24%
RARELY (3)	433	207	226	78	148	215	218	288	116	172	63	109	94	53	868
	25%	23%	27%	28%	26%	25%	25%	28%	25%	30%	29%	31%	22%	21%	25%
NEVER (4)	793	431	362	128	234	372	421	459	224	235	101	134	111	110	1473
	46%	48%	44%	46%	42%	43%	48%	44%	47%	41%	47%	38%	27%	44%	43%
NO OPINION	11	4	7	2	5	5	6	8	1	7	3	4	7	1	27
	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
NO RESPONSE	10	6	4	0	4	8	2	4	1	3	0	3	3	1	18
	0	1%	*	0	1%	1%	*	*	*	1%	0	1%	1%	*	0
MEAN	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.0	2.6	3.0	3.1

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION G: SOCIAL LIFE

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION G9/HG9

LAST TIME SAW CHILD(REN) (ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO HAVE AT LEAST ONE CHILD)

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
PERCENT ASKED	1393 80%	722 80%	671 81%	222 80%	449 81%	698 81%	695 79%	832 80%	375 79%	457 81%	178 82%	279 80%	293 71%	193 78%	2711 79%
TODAY	318 18%	148 16%	170 20%	51 18%	119 21%	173 20%	145 17%	283 27%	133 28%	150 26%	64 29%	86 25%	104 25%	53 21%	758 22%
WITHIN 2 - 3 DAYS	468 27%	254 28%	214 26%	73 26%	141 25%	228 27%	240 27%	241 23%	104 22%	137 24%	53 24%	84 24%	49 12%	60 24%	818 24%
DURING THE PAST WEEK	258 15%	126 14%	132 16%	42 15%	90 16%	125 15%	133 15%	140 13%	62 13%	78 14%	25 12%	53 15%	60 14%	32 13%	490 14%
DURING THE PAST TWO WEEKS	96 6%	51 6%	45 5%	15 5%	30 5%	46 5%	50 6%	43 4%	19 4%	24 4%	11 5%	13 4%	15 4%	12 5%	166 5%
DURING THE PAST MONTH	82 5%	46 5%	36 4%	16 6%	20 4%	34 4%	48 5%	42 4%	20 4%	22 4%	8 4%	14 4%	17 4%	15 6%	156 5%
DURING THE PAST THREE MONTHS	54 3%	25 3%	29 3%	11 4%	18 3%	23 3%	31 4%	18 2%	12 3%	6 1%	3 1%	3 1%	19 5%	5 2%	96 3%
DURING THE PAST SIX MONTHS	34 2%	25 3%	9 1%	3 1%	6 1%	19 2%	15 2%	13 1%	4 1%	9 2%	3 1%	6 2%	7 2%	4 2%	58 2%
DURING THE PAST YEAR	30 2%	20 2%	10 1%	3 1%	7 1%	15 2%	15 2%	23 2%	10 2%	13 2%	5 2%	8 2%	2 *	2 1%	57 2%
ONE - TO - TWO YEARS AGO	30 2%	14 2%	16 2%	6 2%	10 2%	20 2%	10 1%	16 2%	5 1%	11 2%	4 2%	7 2%	5 1%	5 2%	56 2%
HARDLY EVER	20 1%	12 1%	8 1%	1 *	7 1%	13 2%	7 1%	11 1%	4 1%	7 1%	2 1%	5 1%	10 2%	3 1%	44 1%
NEVER	2 *	1 *	1 *	0 0	1 *	2 *	0 0	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 *	2 1%	6 *
NO RESPONSE	1 *	0 0	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	4 1%	0 0	6 *

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION F: PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION F6

NUMBER OF FRIENDS

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
TOO MANY	35	22	13	4	9	15	20	9	4	5	1	4	5	3	52
	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
JUST RIGHT	1353	704	649	232	417	637	716	843	374	469	181	288	273	201	2670
	78%	78%	78%	84%	75%	74%	82%	81%	79%	83%	83%	82%	66%	81%	78%
TOO FEW	338	173	165	40	125	198	140	176	87	89	34	55	126	45	685
	19%	19%	20%	14%	22%	23%	16%	17%	18%	15%	16%	16%	30%	18%	20%
NO RESPONSE	9	4	5	1	4	7	2	11	7	4	1	3	11	0	31
	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	*	1%	2%	1%	*	1%	3%	0	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION F: PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

QUESTION F9H

FREQUENCY OF FEELING ...

H. LONELY OR REMOTE FROM OTHER PEOPLE DURING PAST FEW WEEKS

	PARTICIPANTS							NON PARTICIPANTS							
			OLDER SITES							OLDER SITES					
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	903	832	277	555	857	878	1039	472	567	217	350	415	249	3438
OFTEN (1)	109	55	54	11	43	63	46	59	31	28	7	21	68	14	250
	6%	6%	7%	4%	8%	7%	5%	6%	7%	5%	3%	6%	16%	5%	7%
SOMETIMES (2)	354	187	167	58	109	176	178	172	78	94	40	54	130	54	710
	20%	21%	20%	21%	20%	21%	20%	17%	16%	16%	18%	15%	31%	22%	21%
RARELY (3)	339	168	171	58	113	170	169	240	106	134	47	87	85	37	701
	20%	19%	21%	21%	20%	20%	19%	23%	22%	24%	22%	25%	20%	15%	20%
NEVER (4)	920	488	432	149	283	440	480	559	253	306	121	185	123	142	1744
	53%	54%	52%	54%	51%	51%	55%	54%	54%	54%	56%	53%	30%	57%	51%
NO OPINION	6	2	4	0	4	4	2	5	1	4	2	2	7	2	20
	*	*	*	0	1%	1%	*	*	*	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
NO RESPONSE	7	3	4	1	3	4	3	4	3	1	0	1	2	0	13
	1%	*	*	*	0	*	1%	*	1%	*	0	*	1%	0	*
MEAN	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	2.6	3.2	3.2

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX D

FREQUENCY OF SITE ATTENDANCE/

HOME DELIVERY SERVICE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Question A1 Frequency of Meal[1]	D-2
Multivariate Analyses	D-3
Illustrative Tabulations	D-6

[1] This table includes distributions for all elderly subpopulations: TRAC refers to tracked Wave I respondents; NTRAC refers to non-tracked elderly; NEWER and OLDER sites were established post-1975 and pre-1975, respectively.

NUTRITION WAVE II

SECTION A: PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH NUTRITION PROGRAM

BASE = SITE PARTICIPANTS, HOME-DELIVERED, FORMER SITE PARTICIPANTS

QUESTION A1/HA1

FREQUENCY OF MEAL

	PARTICIPANTS									
			OLDER SITES							
	TOTAL	NEWER SITES	TOTAL	TRAC	NONT	RECENT ENTRY	LONGER TERM	HDM	FORMER	TOTAL
TOTAL	1735	915	820	277	543	855	880	415	227	2377
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	648	331	317	114	203	279	369	340	71	1059
	37%	36%	39%	41%	37%	33%	42%	82%	31%	45%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	156	85	71	28	43	63	93	14	10	180
	9%	9%	9%	10%	8%	7%	11%	3%	5%	8%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	260	142	118	42	76	120	140	18	23	301
	15%	16%	14%	15%	14%	14%	16%	4%	10%	13%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	221	120	101	35	66	113	108	27	33	281
	13%	13%	12%	13%	12%	13%	12%	7%	15%	12%
ONCE A WEEK	173	83	90	29	61	100	73	8	20	201
	10%	9%	11%	10%	11%	12%	8%	2%	9%	8%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	86	49	37	10	27	44	42	0	7	93
	5%	6%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	0	3%	4%
MONTHLY	51	19	32	7	25	30	21	1	7	59
	3%	2%	4%	2%	5%	3%	2%	*	3%	2%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	90	48	42	10	32	67	23	4	34	128
	5%	5%	5%	4%	6%	8%	3%	1%	15%	5%
OTHER	33	26	7	2	5	23	10	2	12	47
	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	5%	2%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	17	12	5	0	5	16	1	1	10	28
	1%	1%	1%	0	1%	2%	*	*	4%	1%

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were employed to assess the relationships between frequency of meal site attendance and two sets of variables. Separate analyses were conducted for each set of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 19.1 percent of the variance for attendance frequency, F, 14 and 1023 df, = 17.1, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A8 : $F = 7.1$, $p < .01$
Q.A10a : $F = 15.1$, $p < .01$
Q.B3 : $F = 22.3$, $p < .01$
Q.B4 : $F = 15.7$, $p < .01$
Q.B10 : $F = 57.6$, $p < .01$
Q.B11 : $F = 14.9$, $p < .01$
Q.B15 : $F = 4.7$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 13.4 percent of the variance for attendance frequency, F, 24 and 1013 df, = 6.5, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C1	$F = 42.4$, $p < .01$
Q.C3	$F = 3.9$, $p < .05$
Q.E6	$F = 20.6$, $p < .01$
Q.H2	$F = 3.1$, $p < .10$ (tendency)
Q.L7	$F = 5.1$, $p < .05$
Q.L8	$F = 22.6$, $p < .01$
Q.I6	$F = 6.0$, $p < .05$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 15.6 percent of the variance of past attendance frequency, F, 14 and 105 df, = 1.4, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further analyses were conducted.

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 11.8 percent of the variance of past attendance frequency, F, 24 and 95 df, = 0.5, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a significant F value, no further data are presented.

The lack of statistically significant findings is not surprising given that with independent variable set #1, recall of past attitudes and perceptions was used to predict past behavior, and that with independent variable set #2, current demographic and other characteristics were used to predict past attendance frequency.

Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

Because the vast majority of home-delivered meal recipients received their meals at least four times per week (85%), multivariate analyses were not conducted on this highly skewed distribution.

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate significant multivariate findings discussed in the text. Question A8 (Transportation Difficulties) was found to be related to attendance frequency, but because the response distribution was highly skewed (i.e., 89% reported "no difficulty"), and it was unlikely that a bivariate table would reveal its relationship to attendance frequency, this table has been omitted. The following tabulations are included in this appendix:

Table	Page
Attendance Frequency by Increased Contribution	D-7
Attendance Frequency by Participation in Site Activities	D-8
Attendance Frequency by Time Spent Socializing at Site	D-9
Attendance Frequency by Perceived Savings from Eating at Site	D-10,11
Attendance Frequency by Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance	D-12
Attendance Frequency by Use of Site Medical Assistance	D-13
Attendance Frequency by General Mobility	D-14
Attendance Frequency by Ability to Clean and Maintain Home	D-15
Attendance Frequency by Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat	D-16
Attendance Frequency by Perceived Income Sufficiency	D-17
Attendance Frequency by Gender	D-18
Attendance Frequency by Minority Status	D-19
Attendance Frequency by Education	D-20

QUESTION A1 BY A10A

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY INCREASED CONTRIBUTION

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE
TOTAL	785	737	421	399	364	338	280	462	505	275
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	298 38%	245 33%	158 38%	129 32%	140 38%	116 34%	88 31%	134 29%	210 42%	111 40%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	94 12%	55 8%	56 13%	24 6%	38 10%	31 9%	29 10%	33 7%	65 13%	22 8%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	122 16%	105 14%	61 14%	64 16%	61 17%	41 12%	51 18%	54 12%	71 14%	51 19%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	93 12%	103 14%	48 11%	60 15%	45 12%	43 13%	30 11%	68 15%	63 12%	35 13%
ONCE A WEEK	72 9%	87 12%	37 9%	43 11%	35 10%	44 13%	31 11%	63 13%	41 8%	24 9%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	43 5%	39 5%	29 7%	19 5%	14 4%	20 6%	15 5%	27 6%	28 6%	12 4%
MONTHLY	25 3%	24 3%	11 3%	8 2%	14 4%	16 5%	11 4%	19 4%	14 3%	5 2%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	29 4%	49 7%	15 4%	27 7%	14 4%	22 7%	18 7%	40 9%	11 2%	9 3%
OTHER	5 1%	22 3%	4 1%	18 4%	1 *	4 1%	3 1%	17 4%	2 *	5 2%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	4 0	8 1%	2 *	7 2%	2 1%	1 *	4 2%	7 1%	0 0	1 *

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A1 BY B3

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY PARTICIPATION IN SITE ACTIVITIES

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER
TOTAL	480	529	449	239	283	230	241	246	219	198	248	244	282	281	205
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	229 48%	185 35%	132 30%	120 50%	93 33%	60 26%	109 45%	92 37%	72 33%	83 42%	82 33%	67 27%	146 52%	103 37%	65 32%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	57 12%	43 8%	30 7%	32 13%	24 8%	12 5%	25 10%	19 8%	18 8%	18 9%	21 8%	9 4%	39 14%	22 8%	21 10%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	83 17%	95 18%	47 11%	40 17%	57 20%	24 11%	43 18%	38 15%	23 11%	39 20%	37 15%	20 8%	44 16%	58 20%	27 13%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	49 10%	75 14%	69 15%	21 9%	44 16%	40 17%	28 12%	31 13%	29 13%	25 13%	36 15%	35 14%	24 8%	39 14%	34 17%
ONCE A WEEK	36 8%	68 13%	42 9%	11 4%	33 12%	23 10%	25 10%	35 14%	19 9%	18 9%	38 15%	26 11%	18 6%	30 11%	16 8%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	14 3%	23 5%	31 7%	9 4%	13 5%	15 7%	5 2%	10 4%	16 7%	6 3%	9 4%	19 8%	8 3%	14 5%	12 6%
MONTHLY	4 1%	12 2%	28 6%	0 0	3 1%	12 5%	4 2%	9 4%	16 7%	3 1%	7 3%	16 7%	1 *	5 2%	12 6%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	6 1%	20 4%	46 10%	4 2%	10 3%	25 11%	2 1%	10 4%	21 10%	4 2%	14 6%	34 14%	2 1%	6 2%	12 6%
OTHER	2 *	7 1%	18 4%	2 1%	5 2%	14 6%	0 0	2 1%	4 2%	2 1%	3 1%	13 5%	0 0	4 1%	5 2%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	0 0	1 *	6 1%	0 0	1 *	5 2%	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 *	5 2%	0 0	0 0	1 *

QUESTION A1 BY B4

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY TIME SPENT SOCIALIZING AT SITE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME
TOTAL	737	571	423	376	311	213	361	260	210	313	274	267	424	297	156
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	327 44%	203 35%	116 28%	168 45%	108 35%	51 24%	159 44%	95 36%	65 31%	123 39%	85 31%	71 27%	204 48%	118 40%	45 29%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	82 11%	44 8%	30 7%	40 11%	27 9%	14 7%	42 12%	17 7%	16 8%	29 9%	18 7%	16 6%	53 13%	26 9%	14 9%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	126 17%	79 14%	55 13%	63 17%	41 13%	34 16%	63 18%	38 15%	21 10%	57 18%	33 12%	31 12%	69 16%	46 15%	24 15%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	93 13%	76 13%	52 12%	52 14%	41 13%	26 12%	41 11%	35 13%	26 12%	46 15%	38 14%	29 11%	47 11%	38 13%	23 15%
ONCE A WEEK	51 7%	70 12%	52 12%	20 5%	40 13%	23 11%	31 9%	30 12%	29 14%	25 8%	41 15%	34 13%	26 6%	29 10%	18 11%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	23 3%	32 6%	31 8%	13 3%	19 6%	17 8%	10 3%	13 5%	14 7%	12 4%	16 6%	16 6%	11 3%	16 5%	15 10%
MONTHLY	10 1%	15 3%	26 6%	5 1%	5 2%	9 4%	5 1%	10 4%	17 8%	6 2%	7 3%	17 6%	4 1%	8 3%	9 6%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	18 3%	33 6%	39 9%	10 3%	14 4%	24 11%	8 2%	19 7%	15 7%	9 3%	23 8%	35 13%	9 2%	10 3%	4 2%
OTHER	5 1%	14 2%	13 3%	4 1%	12 4%	9 4%	1 *	2 1%	4 2%	4 1%	9 3%	9 3%	1 *	5 2%	4 3%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	2 *	5 1%	9 2%	1 *	4 1%	6 3%	1 *	1 *	3 1%	2 1%	4 1%	9 3%	0 0	1 *	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A1 BY B10

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY PERCEIVED SAVINGS FROM EATING AT SITE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS											
	TOTAL				POST-1975 SITES				PRE-1975 SITES			
	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY
TOTAL	417	641	375	246	238	325	191	124	179	316	184	122
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	214 51%	255 40%	116 31%	47 19%	122 51%	129 40%	49 26%	21 17%	92 51%	126 40%	67 36%	26 21%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	33 8%	72 11%	29 8%	21 9%	19 8%	32 10%	19 10%	10 8%	14 8%	40 13%	10 5%	11 9%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	51 12%	103 16%	65 17%	38 16%	28 12%	49 15%	37 19%	22 18%	23 13%	54 17%	28 15%	16 13%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	43 10%	80 13%	52 14%	39 16%	29 12%	49 15%	27 14%	13 10%	14 8%	31 10%	25 14%	26 21%
ONCE A WEEK	28 7%	52 8%	50 13%	30 12%	10 4%	27 8%	23 12%	18 15%	18 10%	25 8%	27 15%	12 10%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	14 3%	21 3%	24 6%	20 8%	8 4%	11 3%	17 9%	8 6%	6 3%	10 3%	7 4%	12 10%
MONTHLY	12 3%	13 2%	7 2%	18 7%	5 2%	2 1%	3 2%	9 7%	7 4%	11 3%	4 2%	9 8%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	9 2%	27 4%	24 6%	24 10%	5 2%	13 4%	12 6%	15 12%	4 2%	14 4%	12 6%	9 7%
OTHER	11 3%	10 2%	6 2%	6 2%	10 4%	7 2%	3 2%	6 5%	1 1%	3 1%	3 2%	0 0
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	2 1%	8 1%	2 1%	3 1%	2 1%	6 2%	1 0	2 2%	0 0	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%

QUESTION A1 BY B10

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY PERCEIVED SAVINGS FROM EATING AT SITE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS							
	RECENT ENTRY				LONGER TERM			
	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY
TOTAL	197	326	193	113	220	315	182	133
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	78 40%	119 37%	55 28%	22 19%	136 62%	136 43%	61 34%	25 19%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	12 6%	30 9%	13 7%	7 6%	21 10%	42 14%	16 9%	14 11%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	24 12%	49 15%	32 17%	13 11%	27 12%	54 17%	33 18%	25 19%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	23 12%	41 13%	25 13%	19 17%	20 9%	39 13%	27 15%	20 15%
ONCE A WEEK	22 11%	29 9%	30 15%	13 12%	6 3%	23 7%	20 11%	17 13%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	9 4%	11 3%	11 6%	10 9%	5 2%	10 3%	13 7%	10 7%
MONTHLY	9 4%	9 3%	3 2%	8 7%	3 1%	4 1%	4 2%	10 7%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	9 5%	23 7%	18 9%	15 13%	0 0	4 1%	6 3%	9 7%
OTHER	9 5%	7 2%	4 2%	3 3%	2 1%	3 1%	2 1%	3 2%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	2 1%	8 2%	2 1%	3 3%	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0

QUESTION A1 BY B11

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE
TOTAL	405	1300	195	700	210	600	179	653	226	647
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	210 52%	434 33%	103 53%	224 32%	107 51%	210 35%	84 47%	193 30%	126 56%	241 37%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	29 7%	125 10%	8 4%	72 10%	21 10%	53 9%	8 4%	54 8%	21 9%	71 11%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	55 14%	198 15%	30 15%	107 15%	25 12%	91 15%	22 12%	93 14%	33 15%	105 16%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	54 13%	166 13%	25 13%	94 13%	29 14%	72 12%	30 17%	82 13%	24 11%	84 13%
ONCE A WEEK	26 6%	140 11%	16 8%	66 9%	10 5%	74 12%	14 8%	80 12%	12 5%	60 9%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	10 2%	76 6%	3 2%	46 7%	7 3%	30 5%	7 4%	37 6%	3 1%	39 6%
MONTHLY	0 0	49 4%	0 0	17 3%	0 0	32 5%	0 0	29 4%	0 0	20 3%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	17 4%	72 5%	7 4%	41 6%	10 5%	31 5%	11 6%	55 8%	6 3%	17 3%
OTHER	2 1%	29 2%	2 1%	24 4%	0 0	5 1%	1 1%	20 3%	1 *	9 2%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	2 1%	11 1%	1 0	9 1%	1 *	2 1%	2 1%	10 2%	0 0	1 *

QUESTION A1 BY B15

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY USE OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	HAVE USED	HAVE NOT USED	HAVE USED	HAVE NOT USED	HAVE USED	HAVE NOT USED	HAVE USED	HAVE NOT USED	HAVE USED	HAVE NOT USED
TOTAL	476	427	242	206	234	221	192	209	284	218
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY D...)	192 40%	155 36%	95 39%	74 36%	97 42%	81 37%	77 40%	65 31%	115 41%	90 41%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	53 11%	39 9%	24 10%	21 10%	29 12%	18 8%	21 11%	15 7%	32 11%	24 11%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	74 16%	69 16%	33 14%	36 18%	41 18%	33 15%	29 15%	32 15%	45 16%	37 17%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	51 11%	59 14%	30 12%	31 15%	21 9%	28 13%	18 9%	27 13%	33 12%	32 15%
ONCE A WEEK	50 10%	42 10%	26 11%	20 10%	24 10%	22 10%	23 12%	25 12%	27 10%	17 8%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	24 5%	17 4%	17 7%	5 2%	7 3%	12 5%	6 3%	13 6%	18 6%	4 2%
MONTHLY	10 2%	17 4%	3 1%	7 3%	7 3%	10 5%	6 3%	9 4%	4 1%	8 4%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	14 3%	24 6%	8 3%	8 4%	6 3%	16 7%	7 4%	19 9%	7 2%	5 2%
OTHER	5 1%	4 1%	4 2%	3 1%	1 *	1 *	2 1%	3 2%	3 1%	1 *
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	3 1%	1 *	2 1%	1 1%	1 *	0 0	3 2%	1 1%	0 0	0 0

QUESTION A1 BY C1

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY GENERAL MOBILITY

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	1405	328	730	173	675	155	681	174	724	154
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	570 40%	77 23%	284 39%	44 25%	286 42%	33 21%	247 36%	32 18%	323 45%	45 29%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	139 10%	17 5%	74 10%	7 4%	65 10%	10 6%	56 8%	7 4%	83 11%	10 6%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	210 15%	50 15%	113 15%	25 15%	97 14%	25 16%	95 14%	26 15%	115 16%	24 16%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	173 12%	48 15%	95 13%	24 14%	78 12%	24 16%	85 13%	28 16%	88 12%	20 13%
ONCE A WEEK	114 8%	59 18%	50 7%	33 19%	64 9%	26 17%	68 10%	32 18%	46 6%	27 17%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	67 5%	18 6%	40 5%	9 5%	27 4%	9 6%	32 5%	11 6%	35 5%	7 5%
MONTHLY	33 2%	18 6%	13 2%	6 4%	20 3%	12 8%	23 3%	7 4%	10 1%	11 7%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	66 5%	24 7%	34 5%	14 8%	32 5%	10 6%	48 7%	19 11%	18 3%	5 3%
OTHER	23 2%	10 3%	19 3%	7 4%	4 1%	3 2%	17 3%	6 4%	6 1%	4 3%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	10 1%	7 2%	8 1%	4 2%	2 *	3 2%	10 1%	6 4%	0 0	1 1%

QUESTION A1 BY C3

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY ABILITY TO CLEAN AND MAINTAIN HOME

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	ABLE	UNABLE	ABLE	UNABLE	ABLE	UNABLE	ABLE	UNABLE	ABLE	UNABLE
TOTAL	1548	167	805	84	743	83	761	87	787	80
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	561 36%	75 45%	275 34%	44 52%	286 38%	31 37%	241 31%	34 39%	320 41%	41 52%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	145 10%	10 6%	76 10%	4 5%	69 9%	6 7%	59 8%	4 5%	86 11%	6 8%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	237 15%	21 12%	128 16%	9 11%	109 15%	12 14%	107 14%	13 15%	130 16%	8 10%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	196 13%	24 14%	108 13%	11 13%	88 12%	13 16%	97 13%	15 17%	99 13%	9 11%
ONCE A WEEK	156 10%	16 10%	74 9%	8 9%	82 11%	8 10%	92 12%	8 9%	64 8%	8 10%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	78 5%	8 5%	46 6%	3 4%	32 4%	5 6%	40 5%	4 5%	38 5%	4 5%
MONTHLY	48 3%	3 2%	19 2%	0 0	29 4%	3 4%	28 4%	2 2%	20 2%	1 1%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	82 5%	7 4%	44 6%	4 5%	38 5%	3 4%	60 8%	6 7%	22 3%	1 1%
OTHER	31 2%	1 1%	25 3%	0 0	6 1%	1 1%	23 3%	0 0	8 1%	1 1%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	14 1%	2 1%	10 1%	1 1%	4 1%	1 1%	14 2%	1 1%	0 0	1 1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A1 BY E6

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY FREQUENCY OF INVITING OTHERS FOR MEALS

	SITE PARTICIPANTS															
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER
TOTAL	293	586	849	153	303	443	140	283	406	149	281	421	144	305	428
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	77	187	382	41	88	199	36	99	183	31	80	167	46	107	215
	26%	32%	45%	27%	29%	45%	26%	35%	45%	21%	28%	40%	32%	35%	50%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	26	57	73	13	29	39	13	28	34	12	23	28	14	34	45
	9%	10%	9%	8%	10%	9%	9%	10%	8%	8%	8%	7%	10%	11%	11%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	55	84	121	28	43	67	27	41	54	25	36	60	30	48	61
	19%	14%	14%	18%	14%	15%	19%	14%	13%	17%	13%	14%	21%	16%	14%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	36	80	103	21	45	51	15	35	52	18	33	61	18	47	42
	12%	14%	12%	14%	15%	11%	11%	12%	13%	12%	12%	14%	12%	16%	10%
ONCE A WEEK	35	64	74	17	35	31	18	29	43	21	36	43	14	28	31
	12%	11%	9%	11%	11%	7%	13%	10%	11%	14%	13%	10%	10%	9%	7%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	21	40	25	14	18	17	7	22	8	10	19	15	11	21	10
	7%	7%	3%	9%	6%	4%	5%	8%	2%	7%	7%	4%	8%	7%	2%
MONTHLY	13	22	16	2	12	5	11	10	11	8	13	9	5	9	7
	5%	4%	2%	1%	4%	1%	8%	4%	3%	5%	5%	2%	3%	3%	2%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	21	33	35	10	16	21	11	17	14	16	26	24	5	7	11
	7%	5%	4%	7%	5%	5%	8%	6%	3%	11%	9%	6%	3%	2%	3%
OTHER	5	15	13	3	15	8	2	0	5	4	11	8	1	4	5
	2%	2%	1%	2%	5%	2%	1%	0	1%	2%	4%	2%	1%	1%	1%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	4	4	7	4	2	5	0	2	2	4	4	6	0	0	1
	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	0	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	0	0	*

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A1 BY H2

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY PERCEIVED INCOME SUFFICIENCY

SITE PARTICIPANTS

	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	VERY WELL	FAIRLY WELL	POORLY	VERY WELL	FAIRLY WELL	POORLY	VERY WELL	FAIRLY WELL	POORLY	VERY WELL	FAIRLY WELL	POORLY	VERY WELL	FAIRLY WELL	POORLY
TOTAL	578	905	228	293	471	127	285	434	101	273	446	126	305	459	102
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	185	348	105	82	185	56	103	163	49	73	149	54	112	199	51
	32%	38%	46%	28%	39%	44%	36%	38%	48%	27%	34%	43%	37%	43%	50%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	50	83	21	32	38	9	18	45	12	17	36	9	33	47	12
	9%	9%	9%	11%	8%	7%	6%	10%	12%	6%	8%	7%	11%	10%	12%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	77	145	35	42	74	20	35	71	15	34	68	19	43	77	16
	13%	16%	15%	14%	16%	16%	12%	16%	15%	12%	15%	15%	14%	17%	15%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	84	99	34	44	54	19	40	45	15	37	50	23	47	49	11
	15%	11%	15%	15%	11%	15%	14%	10%	15%	14%	11%	18%	15%	11%	11%
ONCE A WEEK	81	79	13	36	38	9	45	41	4	41	50	9	40	29	4
	14%	9%	6%	12%	8%	7%	16%	10%	4%	15%	11%	7%	13%	6%	4%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	34	46	6	18	27	4	16	19	2	21	21	2	13	25	4
	6%	5%	3%	6%	6%	3%	6%	5%	2%	8%	5%	2%	4%	5%	4%
MONTHLY	20	28	2	9	9	1	11	19	1	12	16	1	8	12	1
	3%	3%	1%	3%	2%	1%	4%	4%	1%	4%	4%	1%	3%	3%	1%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	29	54	5	15	31	2	14	23	3	23	40	3	6	14	2
	5%	6%	2%	5%	7%	1%	5%	5%	3%	8%	9%	2%	2%	3%	2%
OTHER	14	17	1	11	13	1	3	4	0	11	10	1	3	7	0
	2%	2%	*	4%	3%	1%	1%	1%	0	4%	2%	1%	1%	2%	0
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	4	6	6	4	2	6	0	4	0	4	6	5	0	0	1
	1%	1%	3%	2%	*	5%	0	1%	0	2%	1%	4%	0	0	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A1 BY L7

ATTENDENCE FREQUENCY BY GENDER

BASE = SITE PARTICIPANTS

	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS	
	MALE	FEMALE
TOTAL	473	1256
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	200 42%	447 36%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	49 10%	106 8%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	76 16%	184 15%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	55 12%	164 13%
ONCE A WEEK	32 7%	140 11%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	21 4%	65 5%
MONTHLY	8 2%	43 3%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	18 4%	71 6%
OTHER	8 2%	25 2%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	6 1%	11 1%

QUESTION A1 BY L8

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY MINORITY STATUS

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY
TOTAL	321	1407	203	696	118	711	157	697	164	710
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	161 50%	485 34%	95 47%	232 33%	66 56%	253 36%	71 45%	208 30%	90 55%	277 39%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	21 7%	134 9%	9 4%	71 10%	12 10%	63 9%	3 2%	60 9%	18 11%	74 10%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	64 20%	196 14%	43 21%	95 14%	21 18%	101 14%	33 21%	88 13%	31 19%	108 15%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	30 9%	189 13%	18 9%	100 14%	12 10%	89 13%	20 13%	92 13%	10 6%	97 14%
ONCE A WEEK	17 5%	155 11%	14 7%	68 10%	3 2%	87 12%	10 6%	90 13%	7 4%	65 9%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	8 2%	78 6%	7 3%	42 6%	1 1%	36 5%	6 4%	38 5%	2 1%	40 6%
MONTHLY	0 0	51 4%	0 0	19 3%	0 0	32 4%	0 0	30 4%	0 0	21 3%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	10 3%	79 6%	8 4%	40 6%	2 2%	39 5%	7 5%	59 8%	3 2%	20 3%
OTHER	5 2%	28 2%	5 3%	21 3%	0 0	7 1%	2 1%	21 3%	3 2%	7 1%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	5 2%	12 1%	4 2%	8 1%	1 1%	4 1%	5 3%	11 2%	0 0	1 *

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A1 BY I6

ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY BY EDUCATION

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE
TOTAL	721	699	303	373	354	170	348	345	133	320	368	164	401	331	139
MONDAY-FRIDAY (EVERY DAY)	309 43%	243 35%	90 30%	153 41%	127 36%	46 27%	156 45%	116 34%	44 33%	130 41%	105 29%	43 26%	179 45%	138 42%	47 34%
FOUR TIMES A WEEK	60 8%	66 9%	28 9%	32 9%	29 8%	19 11%	28 8%	37 11%	9 7%	15 5%	35 9%	12 7%	45 11%	31 9%	16 12%
THREE TIMES A WEEK	106 15%	105 15%	49 16%	58 16%	59 17%	21 12%	48 14%	46 13%	28 21%	46 14%	53 14%	22 13%	60 15%	52 16%	27 19%
TWO TIMES A WEEK	90 12%	89 13%	39 13%	41 11%	47 13%	28 16%	49 14%	42 12%	11 8%	45 14%	47 13%	20 12%	45 11%	42 13%	19 14%
ONCE A WEEK	53 7%	80 12%	40 13%	28 7%	37 10%	18 11%	25 7%	43 12%	22 17%	26 8%	47 13%	27 17%	27 7%	33 10%	13 9%
TWO TO THREE TIMES A MONTH	27 4%	43 6%	16 5%	19 5%	18 5%	12 7%	8 2%	25 7%	4 3%	11 3%	23 6%	10 6%	16 4%	20 6%	6 4%
MONTHLY	19 3%	21 3%	10 3%	8 2%	6 2%	5 3%	11 3%	15 4%	5 4%	9 3%	15 4%	5 3%	10 2%	6 2%	5 4%
LESS OFTEN THAN MONTHLY	38 5%	31 4%	21 7%	21 6%	14 4%	13 8%	17 5%	17 5%	8 6%	23 7%	25 7%	19 12%	15 4%	6 2%	2 1%
OTHER	12 2%	13 2%	8 3%	9 2%	11 3%	6 4%	3 1%	2 1%	2 1%	8 3%	11 3%	4 3%	4 1%	2 0	4 3%
DON'T KNOW/CAN'T SAY/NO RESPONSE	7 1%	8 1%	2 1%	4 1%	6 2%	2 1%	3 1%	2 1%	0 0	7 2%	7 2%	2 1%	0 0	1 *	0 0

APPENDIX E

LIKELIHOOD OF FUTURE ATTENDANCE AMONG FORMER CONGREGATE PARTICIPANTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	E-2
Illustrative Tabulations	E-4

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were employed to assess the relationships between former participants' likelihood of future congregate service attendance and two sets of variables. Separate analyses were conducted for each set of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B5 : Pleasantness of Meal Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tasted Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 18.8 percent of the variance in likelihood to participate in the future, F, 14 and 112 df, = 1.9, $p < .05$. Significant univariate F values were found for the following variable in this regression equation:

Q.B10 : $F = 4.5$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 27.8 percent of the variance in likelihood to attend in the future, F, 24 and 102 df, = 1.6, $p < .05$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C3 : $F = 4.1$, $p < .05$
Q.I1 : $F = 5.0$, $p < .05$

Participants and Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

Because more than 9 out of 10 current participants and home-delivered meal recipients intended to remain actively enrolled in the services, multivariate analyses to predict this intention were not conducted.

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text.

Table	Page
Likelihood of Future Attendance by Perceived Savings from Eating at Site	E-5
Likelihood of Future Attendance by Ability to Clean and Maintain Home	E-6
Likelihood of Future Attendance by Marital Status	E-7

QUESTION A4A BY B10

LIKELIHOOD OF FUTURE ATTENDANCE BY PERCEIVED SAVINGS FROM EATING AT SITE

	FORMER PARTICIPANTS			
	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY
TOTAL	25	81	66	59
VERY LIKELY	12 48%	16 20%	8 12%	5 9%
FAIRLY LIKELY	5 20%	24 30%	19 29%	15 26%
NOT VERY LIKELY	3 12%	20 25%	17 26%	22 37%
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	5 20%	19 23%	18 27%	15 25%
NO OPINION	0 0	2 2%	3 5%	2 3%
NO RESPONSE	0 0	0 0	1 1%	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

QUESTION A4A BY C3

LIKELIHOOD OF FUTURE ATTENDANCE BY ABILITY TO CLEAN AND MAINTAIN HOME

	FORMER PARTICIPANTS	
	ABLE	UNABLE
TOTAL	204	44
VERY LIKELY	41 20%	2 4%
FAIRLY LIKELY	60 29%	7 16%
NOT VERY LIKELY	54 27%	11 25%
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	41 20%	22 50%
NO OPINION	6 3%	2 5%
NO RESPONSE	2 1%	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

QUESTION A4A BY I1

LIKELIHOOD OF FUTURE ATTENDANCE BY MARITAL STATUS

	FORMER PARTICIPANTS	
	MARRIED	NOT MARRIED
TOTAL	75	173
VERY LIKELY	17 23%	26 15%
FAIRLY LIKELY	22 29%	44 25%
NOT VERY LIKELY	21 28%	45 26%
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	13 17%	50 29%
NO OPINION	2 3%	6 4%
NO RESPONSE	0 0	2 1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX F

ELDERLY CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO
PERCEIVED SITE CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	F-2
Illustrative Tabulations	F-5

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were utilized to assess relationships between perceived site contributions policy and two sets of variables. Separate analyses were conducted for each set of variables.

Indeperdent Variable Set #1

Q.A1 : Frequency of Attendance
Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 17.1 percent of the variance in perceptions of site contributions, F, 14 and 1029 df, = 8.0, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation.

Q.A1 : $F = 7.2$, $p < .01$
Q.A10a : $F = 76.7$, $p < .01$
Q.B4 : $F = 5.7$, $p < .05$
Q.B14 : $F = 6.3$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 2.9 percent of the variance in perceptions of site contributions, F, 24 and 1436 df, = 1.79, $p < .05$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C1 $F = 7.5$, $p < .01$
Q.E4 $F = 5.9$, $p < .05$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 38.7 percent of the variance in perceptions of site contributions policy, F, 14 and 96 df, = 4.3, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A8 $F = 4.1$, $p < .05$
Q.A10a $F = 10.8$, $p < .01$
Q.B10 $F = 5.8$, $p < .05$
Q.B13 $F = 8.5$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 12.9 percent of the variance in perceptions of site contributions policy, F, 24 and 178 df, = 1.1, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a significant F value, no further data are presented. Former participants' current lifestyle and demographic characteristics were weak predictors of their recall of past events.

Results for Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 22.2 percent of the variance in perceptions of site contributions policy, F, 10 and 258 df, = 7.3, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A10a $F = 22.9$, $p < .01$
Q.A12 $F = 52.9$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 22.3 percent of the variance in perceptions of site contributions policy, F, 23 and 215 df, = 2.7, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.E1 $F = 5.4$, $p < .05$
Q.C1 $F = 12.4$, $p < .01$
Q.D12 $F = 4.4$, $p < .05$
Q.G6 $F = 4.9$, $p < .05$
Q.I5 $F = 8.5$, $p < .01$

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate most significant multivariate findings discussed in the text. Tables are presented for those variables for which response distributions are not highly skewed. The following tabulations are included in this appendix:

Table	Page
Perception of Contributions Policy by Frequency of Attendance	F-6
Perception of Contributions Policy by Increased Contribution	F-7, 8
Perception of Contributions Policy by Socializing at the Site (Visiting Friends)	F-9
Perception of Contributions Policy by Awareness of Site Medical Assistance	F-10
Perception of Contributions Policy by General Mobility	F-11
Perception of Contributions Policy by Whether Elderly Usually Eat Alone	F-12
Perception of Contributions Policy by Club/Organization Membership	F-13
Perception of Contributions Policy by Age	F-14

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10 BY A1

PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY BY FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	804	654	260	409	340	142	395	314	118	343	334	164	461	320	96
DONATION	578	451	170	301	241	91	277	210	79	235	222	105	343	229	65
	72%	69%	65%	74%	71%	64%	70%	67%	67%	69%	67%	64%	74%	72%	68%
CHARGE	125	141	71	70	75	41	55	66	30	53	77	46	72	64	25
	16%	22%	27%	17%	22%	29%	14%	21%	25%	15%	23%	28%	16%	20%	26%
FREE	98	61	17	37	24	9	61	37	8	53	34	11	45	27	6
	12%	9%	7%	9%	7%	6%	15%	12%	7%	15%	10%	7%	10%	8%	6%
DON'T KNOW	3	1	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	0	0
	*	*	1%	*	0	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	*	1%	*	0	0
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10 BY A10A/HA8A

PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY BY INCREASED CONTRIBUTION

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE
TOTAL	785	737	421	399	364	338	280	462	505	275
DONATION	591 75%	599 81%	309 73%	327 82%	282 77%	272 80%	204 73%	361 78%	387 77%	238 87%
CHARGE	194 25%	138 19%	112 27%	72 18%	82 23%	66 20%	76 27%	101 22%	118 23%	37 13%
FREE	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
DON'T KNOW	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10 BY A10A/HA8A

PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY BY INCREASED CONTRIBUTION

	FORMER PARTICIPANTS		HOME DELIVERED MEALS	
	INCREASED	DIDN'T INCREASE	INCREASED	DIDN'T INCREASE
TOTAL	50	148	105	166
DONATION	28 56%	108 73%	64 61%	106 64%
CHARGE	22 44%	40 27%	41 39%	60 36%
FREE	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
DON'T KNOW	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10 BY B4

PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY BY FREQUENCY OF SOCIALIZING AT SITE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME
TOTAL	737	571	423	376	311	213	361	260	210	313	274	267	424	297	156
DONATION	550	393	266	288	223	130	262	170	136	233	175	163	317	218	103
	75%	69%	63%	77%	72%	61%	72%	65%	65%	75%	64%	61%	75%	73%	66%
CHARGE	116	117	105	59	68	59	57	49	46	47	60	71	69	57	34
	16%	20%	25%	16%	22%	28%	16%	19%	22%	15%	22%	27%	16%	19%	22%
FREE	69	57	52	27	20	24	42	37	28	32	35	33	37	22	19
	9%	10%	12%	7%	6%	11%	12%	14%	13%	10%	13%	12%	9%	8%	12%
DON'T KNOW	2	4	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	1	4	0	1	0	0
	*	1%	0	0	0	0	0	2%	0	*	1%	0	*	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10 BY B14

PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY BY AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE
TOTAL	911	476	451	279	460	197	404	230	507	246
DONATION	670	304	347	186	323	118	289	135	381	169
	74%	64%	77%	67%	70%	60%	71%	59%	75%	69%
CHARGE	162	110	80	63	82	47	79	59	83	51
	18%	23%	18%	23%	18%	24%	20%	25%	17%	21%
FREE	77	60	23	29	54	31	35	34	42	26
	8%	13%	5%	10%	12%	16%	9%	15%	8%	10%
DON'T KNOW	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0
	*	*	*	*	*	0	*	1%	*	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10 BY C1

PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY BY GENERAL MOBILITY
(FREQUENCY OF GETTING OUT OF THE HOUSE)

	SITE PARTICIPANTS											
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM		HOME DELIVERED MEALS	
	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	1405	328	730	173	675	155	681	174	724	154	101	311
DONATION	999	210	539	103	460	107	464	107	535	103	60	125
	71%	64%	74%	60%	68%	69%	68%	62%	74%	67%	59%	40%
CHARGE	254	85	138	49	116	36	129	49	125	36	20	90
	18%	26%	19%	28%	17%	23%	19%	28%	17%	23%	20%	29%
FREE	146	33	51	21	95	12	83	18	63	15	16	92
	10%	10%	7%	12%	14%	8%	12%	10%	9%	10%	16%	30%
DON'T KNOW	6	0	2	0	4	0	5	0	1	0	5	4
	1%	0	*	0	1%	0	1%	0	*	0	5%	1%
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

E 11

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10 BY E1

PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY BY WHETHER ELDERLY USUALLY EAT ALONE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	ALONE	NOT ALONE	ALONE	NOT ALONE	ALONE	NOT ALONE	ALONE	NOT ALONE	ALONE	NOT ALONE
TOTAL	1002	729	520	382	482	347	486	369	516	360
DONATION	725	482	376	265	349	217	341	230	384	252
	72%	66%	72%	69%	72%	63%	70%	63%	74%	70%
CHARGE	192	147	106	81	86	66	100	78	92	69
	19%	20%	20%	21%	18%	19%	21%	21%	18%	19%
FREE	80	99	36	36	44	63	41	60	39	39
	8%	14%	7%	10%	9%	18%	8%	16%	8%	11%
DON'T KNOW	5	1	2	0	3	1	4	1	1	0
	1%	*	1%	0	1%	*	1%	*	*	0
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

E12

QUESTION HA8 BY G6

PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY BY CLUB/ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

	HOME DELIVERED MEALS	
	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER
TOTAL	86	327
DONATION	50 58%	135 41%
CHARGE	19 22%	90 28%
FREE	15 18%	95 29%
DON'T KNOW	2 2%	7 2%
NO RESPONSE	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

QUESTION HA8 BY I5

PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY BY AGE

	HOME DELIVERED MEALS	
	LT 75	75+
TOTAL	135	277
DONATION	67 49%	116 42%
CHARGE	31 23%	79 28%
FREE	36 27%	74 27%
DON'T KNOW	1 1%	8 3%
NO RESPONSE	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX G

INCREASED CONTRIBUTIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	G-2
Illustrative Tabulations	G-5

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were employed to assess relationships between elderly having increased their contributions and two sets of variables. Separate analyses were conducted for each set of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A1 : Frequency of Attendance
Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 10.0 percent of the variance of increasing contributions, F, 14 and 1029 df, = 8.2, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A1 : $F = 10.7$, $p < .01$
Q.A10 : $F = 76.7$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 6.7 percent of the variance of increasing contributions, F, 24 and 1420 df, = 4.2, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.G5c : $F = 9.5$, $p < .01$
Q.L8 : $F = 49.0$, $p < .01$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 20.5 percent of the variance of increasing donations, F, 14 and 96 df, = 1.77, p >.05. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further data are presented.

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 20.7 percent of the variance of increasing contributions, F, 24 and 174 df, = 1.9, p< .05. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.E1	F = 5.7, p< .05
Q.L8	F = 8.5, p< .01
Q.I9	F = 6.3, p< .05

Results for Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 23.3 percent of the variance of increasing contributions, F, 10 and 258 df, = 7.8, p< .01. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A10	F = 22.9, p< .01
Q.B10	F = 5.4, p< .05

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 16.6 percent of the variance of increasing contributions, F, 23 and 203 df, = 1.8, p< .05. A significant univariate F value was found for the following variable in this regression equation:

Q.C3	F = 5.0, p < .05

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate most significant multivariate findings discussed in the text. Tables are provided for those relationships whose response distributions were neither highly skewed nor based upon very small sample sizes:

Table	Page
Increased Contribution by Frequency of Attendance	G-6
Increased Contribution by Perception of Contribution Policy	G-7,8
Increased Contribution by Minority Status	G-9
Increased Contribution by Perceived Savings from Service	G-10

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10A BY A1

INCREASED CONTRIBUTION BY FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE

BASE = THOSE WHO DO NOT EAT FREE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	804	654	260	409	340	142	395	314	118	343	334	164	461	320	96
PERCENT ASKED	703	592	241	371	316	132	332	276	109	288	299	151	415	293	90
	87%	91%	93%	91%	93%	93%	84%	88%	92%	84%	90%	92%	90%	92%	94%
YES	392	287	102	214	146	59	178	141	43	117	112	47	275	175	55
	49%	44%	39%	52%	43%	42%	45%	45%	36%	34%	34%	29%	60%	55%	57%
NO	300	295	134	153	167	72	147	128	62	167	185	103	133	110	31
	37%	45%	52%	37%	49%	51%	37%	41%	53%	49%	55%	63%	29%	34%	32%
NO RESPONSE	11	10	5	4	3	1	7	7	4	4	2	1	7	8	4
	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	4%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10A BY A10

INCREASED CONTRIBUTION BY PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY

BASE = THOSE WHO DO NOT EAT FREE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	DONATION	CHARGE	DONATION	CHARGE	DONATION	CHARGE	DONATION	CHARGE	DONATION	CHARGE
TOTAL	1211	339	642	187	569	152	573	178	638	161
PERCENT ASKED	1211 100%	339 100%	642 100%	187 100%	569 100%	152 100%	573 100%	178 100%	638 100%	161 100%
YES	591 49%	194 57%	309 48%	112 60%	282 50%	82 54%	204 36%	76 43%	387 61%	118 73%
NO	599 49%	138 41%	327 51%	72 39%	272 48%	66 43%	361 63%	101 57%	238 37%	37 23%
NO RESPONSE	21 2%	7 2%	6 1%	3 2%	15 3%	4 3%	8 1%	1 1%	13 2%	6 4%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10A BY A10

INCREASED CONTRIBUTION BY PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY

	HOME DELIVERED MEALS	
	DONATION	CHARGE
TOTAL	185	111
PERCENT ASKED	185 100%	111 100%
YES	64 35%	41 37%
NO	106 57%	60 54%
NO RESPONSE	15 8%	10 9%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10A/HA8A BY L8

CONTRIBUTION INCREASE BY MINORITY STATUS

BASE = THOSE WHO DO NOT EAT FREE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS										FORMER PARTICIPANTS	
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM			
	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY
TOTAL	321	1407	203	696	118	711	157	697	164	710	36	213
PERCENT ASKED	199 62%	1346 96%	151 74%	674 97%	48 41%	672 95%	88 56%	662 95%	111 68%	684 96%	23 64%	189 89%
YES	72 22%	709 50%	55 27%	362 52%	17 14%	347 49%	22 14%	258 37%	50 30%	451 64%	4 11%	46 22%
NO	124 39%	612 43%	95 47%	304 44%	29 25%	308 43%	64 41%	397 57%	60 37%	215 30%	18 50%	130 61%
NO RESPONSE	3 1%	25 2%	1 *	8 1%	2 2%	17 2%	2 1%	7 1%	1 1%	18 3%	1 3%	13 6%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION A10A BY B10

INCREASED CONTRIBUTION BY PERCEIVED SAVINGS FROM SERVICE

	HOME DELIVERED MEALS			
	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A BIT	SAVES NOTHING/ COSTS MONEY
TOTAL	91	165	91	50
PERCENT ASKED	59	119	67	39
	65%	72%	74%	78%
YES	28	39	20	14
	31%	24%	22%	28%
NO	28	70	39	21
	31%	42%	43%	42%
NO RESPONSE	3	10	8	4
	3%	6%	9%	8%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX H

PERCEIVED SAVINGS ASSOCIATED WITH SERVICE ATTENDANCE AND HOME-DELIVERY SERVICE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	H-2
Illustrative Tabulations	H-4

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were employed to assess the relationships between perceived savings associated with Service attendance/home-delivery and two sets of variables. Separate analyses were conducted for each set of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A1 : Frequency of Attendance
Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B5 : Pleasantness of Meal Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 11.7 percent of the variance of perceived savings, F, 14 and 1029 df, = 9.7, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A1 : $F = 65.6$, $p < .01$
Q.A8 : $F = 5.7$, $p < .05$
Q.B5 : $F = 6.4$, $p < .05$
Q.B9 : $F = 10.8$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 2.8 percent of perceived savings, F, 24 and 1407 df, = 1.7, $p < .05$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C1 : $F = 8.0$, $p < .01$
Q.E6 : $F = 12.6$, $p < .01$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 16.0 percent of the variance of perceived savings, F, 14 and 96 df, = 1.3, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further analyses were conducted.

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 11.4 percent of the variance of perceived savings, F, 24 and 176 df, = 0.9, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a significant F value, no further data are presented.

Results for Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 6.7 percent of the variance of perceived savings, F, 10 and 258 df, = 1.8, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further data are presented.

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 8.9 percent of the variance of perceived savings, F, 23 and 211 df, = 0.9, $p > .05$. Since a statistically significant F value was not obtained, no further data are presented.

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text. If a given independent variable's distribution was highly skewed, and, therefore, it was unlikely to reveal an observable difference in a simple crosstabulation, it is omitted from the following:

Table	Page
Program Saves Money by Frequency of Attendance	H-5
Perceived Savings by General Mobility (Frequency of Getting Out of the House)	H-6
Perceived Savings by Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat (At the Respondent's Home)	H-7

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B10 BY A1

PROGRAM SAVES MONEY BY FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	804	654	260	409	340	142	395	314	118	343	334	164	461	320	96
SAVE A LOT	247	122	46	141	67	28	106	55	18	90	69	36	157	53	10
	31%	19%	18%	34%	20%	20%	27%	18%	15%	26%	21%	22%	34%	17%	11%
SAVE SOME	327	235	71	161	125	33	166	110	38	149	119	50	178	116	21
	41%	36%	27%	39%	37%	23%	42%	35%	32%	44%	36%	30%	39%	36%	22%
SAVE A LITTLE	145	167	61	68	87	35	77	80	26	68	87	36	77	80	25
	18%	26%	24%	17%	26%	25%	19%	25%	22%	20%	26%	22%	17%	25%	26%
SAVE NOTHING	57	95	47	23	48	28	34	47	19	28	40	21	29	55	26
	7%	14%	18%	6%	14%	20%	9%	15%	16%	8%	12%	13%	6%	17%	27%
COSTS MONEY	11	12	21	8	5	10	3	7	11	1	5	15	10	7	6
	1%	2%	8%	2%	1%	7%	1%	2%	10%	*	1%	9%	2%	2%	6%
DON'T KNOW	17	23	13	8	8	8	9	15	5	7	14	6	10	9	7
	2%	3%	5%	2%	2%	5%	2%	5%	4%	2%	4%	4%	2%	3%	7%
NO RESPONSE	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B10 BY C1

PERCEIVED SAVINGS FROM EATING AT SITE BY GENERAL MOBILITY

(FREQUENCY OF GETTING OUT OF THE HOUSE)

	SITE PARTICIPANTS											
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM		HOME DELIVERED MEALS	
	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	1405	328	730	173	675	155	681	174	724	154	0	0
SAVE A LOT	345	70	202	36	143	34	159	36	186	34	0	0
	25%	21%	28%	21%	21%	22%	24%	21%	26%	22%	0	0
SAVE SOME	539	102	271	54	268	48	265	61	274	41	0	0
	38%	31%	37%	31%	40%	31%	39%	35%	38%	27%	0	0
SAVE A LITTLE	294	81	150	41	144	40	152	41	142	40	0	0
	21%	25%	20%	24%	21%	26%	22%	23%	19%	26%	0	0
SAVE NOTHING	149	52	71	30	78	22	70	21	79	31	0	0
	11%	16%	10%	17%	12%	14%	10%	12%	11%	20%	0	0
COSTS MONEY	35	10	19	4	16	6	14	8	21	2	0	0
	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	4%	2%	5%	3%	1%	0	0
DON'T KNOW	42	13	17	8	25	5	21	7	21	6	0	0
	3%	4%	2%	5%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	0	0
NO RESPONSE	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B10 BY E6

PERCEIVED SAVINGS FROM EATING AT SITE BY FREQUENCY OF INVITING OTHERS TO EAT

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER
TOTAL	293	586	849	153	303	443	140	283	406	149	281	421	144	305	428
SAVE A LOT	69	116	230	41	60	136	28	56	94	39	52	105	30	64	125
	24%	20%	27%	27%	20%	31%	20%	20%	23%	26%	19%	25%	21%	21%	29%
SAVE SOME	107	221	311	52	118	154	55	103	157	59	105	160	48	116	151
	36%	38%	37%	34%	39%	35%	39%	36%	39%	40%	37%	38%	33%	38%	35%
SAVE A LITTLE	64	136	175	32	68	91	32	68	84	30	68	95	34	68	80
	22%	23%	20%	21%	22%	20%	23%	24%	21%	20%	24%	23%	24%	22%	19%
SAVE NOTHING	38	71	91	24	36	40	14	35	51	13	33	44	25	38	47
	13%	12%	11%	16%	12%	9%	10%	12%	13%	9%	12%	10%	17%	13%	11%
COSTS MONEY	5	24	15	2	11	9	3	13	6	3	14	4	2	10	11
	2%	4%	2%	1%	4%	2%	2%	5%	1%	2%	5%	1%	1%	3%	3%
DON'T KNOW	9	18	27	2	10	13	7	8	14	5	9	13	4	9	14
	3%	3%	3%	1%	3%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
NO RESPONSE	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	*	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX I

PLEASANTNESS OF CONGREGATE SITES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	I-2
Illustrative Tabulations	I-4

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were employed to assess the relationships between how "pleasant' elderly felt congregate sites were and two sets of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 7.1 percent of the variance of elderly ratings, F, 14 and 976 df, = 5.4, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A10a : $F = 3.8$, $p < .05$
Q.B2 : $F = 11.1$, $p < .01$
Q.B4 : $F = 19.0$, $p < .01$
Q.B9 : $F = 4.9$, $p < .05$
Q.B10 : $F = 6.6$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 5.8 percent of the variance of elderly ratings, F, 24 and 966 df, = 2.5, $p < .05$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.F9e : $F = 5.1$, $p < .05$
Q.G1 : $F = 12.9$, $p < .01$
Q.I6 : $F = 4.9$, $p < .05$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 21.5 percent of the variance of elderly ratings, F, 14 and 100 df, = 2.0, $p < .05$. A significant univariate F value was found for the following variable in this regression equation:

Q.B4 $F = 5.1$, $p < .05$.

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 32.2 percent of the variance of elderly ratings, F, 24 and 90 df, = 1.8, $p < .05$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C3 $F = 4.0$, $p < .05$
Q.F9e $F = 11.5$, $p < .01$
Q.G1 $F = 9.0$, $p < .01$

Illustrative Tabulations

The following tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text. If a given independent variable's distribution was highly skewed, and therefore, it was unlikely to reveal an observable relationship in a simple crosstabulation, it is omitted from these tables. Tables illustrating the "post-dictive" power of former participants' current lifestyle and demographic characteristics on their memories of how pleasant sites were are also omitted due to the rather tenuous nature of these relationships.

Table	Page
Pleasantness of Site by Increased Contribution	I-5
Pleasantness of Site by Frequency of Socializing at Site (Visiting With Friends)	I-6, 7
Pleasantness of Site by Frequency of Feeling Depressed/ Very Unhappy	I-8
Pleasantness of Site by Frequency of Attending Religious Services	I-9
Pleasantness of Site by Education	I-10
Pleasantness of Site by Savings From Eating at Site	I-11, 12

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B5 BY A10A

PLEASANTNESS OF SITE BY INCREASED CONTRIBUTION

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE	DID INCREASE	DID NOT INCREASE
TOTAL	785	737	421	399	364	338	280	462	505	275
VERY PLEASANT	668 85%	606 82%	359 85%	334 84%	309 85%	272 81%	233 83%	374 81%	435 86%	232 84%
FAIRLY PLEASANT	105 14%	116 16%	56 13%	59 15%	49 14%	57 17%	42 15%	78 17%	63 13%	38 14%
NOT TOO PLEASANT	8 1%	11 2%	3 1%	3 1%	5 1%	8 2%	3 1%	8 2%	5 1%	3 1%
VERY UNPLEASANT	1 *	1 *	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 *	1 1%
DON'T KNOW	2 *	2 *	2 1%	2 0	0 0	0 0	1 1%	1 *	1 *	1 *
NO RESPONSE	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	1 *	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B5 BY B4

PLEASANTNESS OF SITE BY FREQUENCY OF SOCIALIZING AT SITE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME
TOTAL	737	571	423	376	311	213	361	260	210	313	274	267	424	297	156
VERY PLEASANT	672	477	303	340	260	159	332	217	144	283	230	193	389	247	110
	91%	84%	72%	90%	84%	75%	92%	84%	68%	90%	84%	72%	92%	83%	70%
FAIRLY PLEASANT	58	89	102	33	48	48	25	41	54	28	43	61	30	46	41
	8%	16%	24%	9%	15%	23%	7%	16%	26%	9%	16%	23%	7%	15%	26%
NOT TOO PLEASANT	4	3	13	1	2	3	3	1	10	2	1	9	2	2	4
	1%	0	3%	*	1%	1%	1%	*	5%	1%	*	3%	1%	1%	3%
VERY UNPLEASANT	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1
	*	*	*	0	*	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	*	1%	1%
DON'T KNOW	2	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
	*	0	1%	1%	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0	1%	*	0	0
NO RESPONSE	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0	1%	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B5 BY B4

PLEASANTNESS OF SITE BY FREQUENCY OF SOCIALIZING AT SITE

	FORMER PARTICIPANTS		
	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME
TOTAL	58	82	104
VERY PLEASANT	48	62	54
	83%	76%	52%
FAIRLY PLEASANT	10	19	39
	17%	23%	37%
NOT TOO PLEASANT	0	1	6
	0	1%	6%
VERY UNPLEASANT	0	0	3
	0	0	3%
DON'T KNOW	0	0	2
	0	0	2%
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0
	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B5 BY F9E

PLEASANTNESS OF SITE BY FREQUENCY OF FEELING DEPRESSED/VERY UNHAPPY

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER
TOTAL	488	433	793	255	207	431	233	226	362	257	215	372	231	218	421
VERY PLEASANT	387	355	695	207	167	379	180	188	316	203	170	326	184	185	369
	79%	82%	88%	81%	81%	88%	77%	83%	87%	79%	79%	88%	80%	85%	88%
FAIRLY PLEASANT	88	70	89	45	36	47	43	34	42	45	42	42	43	28	47
	18%	16%	11%	18%	17%	11%	19%	15%	12%	17%	20%	11%	19%	13%	11%
NOT TOO PLEASANT	8	7	5	1	3	2	7	4	3	7	3	2	1	4	3
	2%	2%	1%	*	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%	3%	1%	0	*	2%	1%
VERY UNPLEASANT	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
	*	*	*	0	1%	*	*	0	*	0	0	0	*	*	*
DON'T KNOW	2	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
	1%	0	*	1%	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	1%	1%	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
	*	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B5 BY G1

PLEASANTNESS OF SITE BY FREQUENCY OF ATTENDING RELIGIOUS SERVICES

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK	ONCE A WEEK	LESS OFTEN	MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK	ONCE A WEEK	LESS OFTEN	MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK	ONCE A WEEK	LESS OFTEN	MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK	ONCE A WEEK	LESS OFTEN	MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK	ONCE A WEEK	LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	374	716	644	192	372	339	182	344	305	184	322	351	190	394	293
VERY PLEASANT	325 87%	607 85%	521 81%	166 86%	313 84%	282 83%	159 87%	294 85%	239 78%	160 87%	272 84%	276 79%	165 87%	335 85%	245 83%
FAIRLY PLEASANT	44 12%	97 14%	110 17%	23 12%	53 14%	54 16%	21 12%	44 13%	56 19%	21 11%	45 14%	67 19%	23 12%	52 13%	43 15%
NOT TOO PLEASANT	5 1%	6 1%	9 1%	3 2%	3 1%	0 0	2 1%	3 1%	9 3%	3 2%	2 1%	7 2%	2 1%	4 1%	2 1%
VERY UNPLEASANT	0 0	1 *	3 1%	0 0	0 0	2 1%	0 0	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 *	3 1%
DON'T KNOW	0 0	3 *	1 *	0 0	3 1%	1 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 *	1 *	0 0	2 1%	0 0
NO RESPONSE	0 0	2 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 1%	0 0	0 0	2 1%	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B5 BY I6

PLEASANTNESS OF SITE BY EDUCATION

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE
TOTAL	721	699	303	373	354	170	348	345	133	320	368	164	401	331	139
VERY PLEASANT	613	589	242	315	302	139	298	287	103	268	304	132	345	285	110
	85%	84%	80%	84%	85%	82%	86%	83%	77%	84%	83%	80%	86%	86%	79%
FAIRLY PLEASANT	95	101	53	52	48	29	43	53	24	45	58	29	50	43	24
	13%	15%	17%	14%	14%	17%	12%	15%	18%	14%	16%	18%	12%	13%	17%
NOT TOO PLEASANT	8	6	6	4	1	1	4	5	5	5	4	3	3	2	3
	1%	1%	2%	1%	*	0	1%	2%	4%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
VERY UNPLEASANT	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
	*	*	1%	0	*	1%	*	0	1%	0	0	0	*	*	2%
DON'T KNOW	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0
	1%	*	0	1%	1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
	*	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B5 BY B10

PLEASANTNESS OF SITE BY SAVINGS FROM EATING AT SITE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS											
	TOTAL				POST-1975 SITES				PRE-1975 SITES			
	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY
TOTAL	417	641	375	246	238	325	191	124	179	316	184	122
VERY PLEASANT	378	546	303	182	216	275	160	90	162	271	143	92
	91%	85%	81%	74%	91%	85%	84%	72%	90%	86%	78%	75%
FAIRLY PLEASANT	35	88	61	58	21	47	27	31	14	41	34	27
	8%	14%	16%	24%	9%	14%	14%	25%	8%	13%	18%	22%
NOT TOO PLEASANT	4	6	4	5	1	2	0	2	3	4	4	3
	1%	1%	1%	2%	*	1%	0	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%
VERY UNPLEASANT	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
	0	0	1%	0	0	0	1%	0	0	0	1%	0
DON'T KNOW	0	1	2	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
	0	*	0	*	0	*	1%	1%	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
	0	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B5 BY B10

PLEASANTNESS OF SITE BY SAVINGS FROM EATING AT SITE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS							
	RECENT ENTRY				LONGER TERM			
	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY	SAVE A LOT	SAVE SOME	SAVE A LITTLE	SAVE NO-THING/ COSTS MONEY
TOTAL	197	326	193	113	220	315	182	133
VERY PLEASANT	174 88%	275 84%	157 81%	80 71%	204 93%	271 86%	146 80%	102 77%
FAIRLY PLEASANT	21 11%	45 14%	32 17%	29 26%	14 6%	43 14%	29 16%	29 22%
NOT TOO PLEASANT	2 1%	5 2%	2 1%	3 2%	2 1%	1 *	2 1%	2 1%
VERY UNPLEASANT	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	3 2%	0 0
DON'T KNOW	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 1%	0 0	0 0	2 1%	0 0
NO RESPONSE	0 0	0 0	2 1%	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX J

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	J-2
Illustrative Tabulations	J-4

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were utilized to assess the relationships between elderly awareness of site education activities and two sets of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tasted Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 9.6 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 15 and 1028 df, = 7.3, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A10 : $F = 6.7$, $p < .01$
Q.B2 : $F = 36.7$, $p < .01$
Q.B3 : $F = 13.9$, $p < .01$
Q.B4 : $F = 9.8$, $p < .01$
Q.B14 : $F = 14.1$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 9.2 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 24 and 1193 df, = 5.0, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C1 : $F = 10.3$, $p < .01$
Q.D13 : $F = 4.6$, $p < .05$
Q.F9e : $F = 8.2$, $p < .01$
Q.H2 : $F = 8.2$, $p < .01$
Q.L7 : $F = 9.2$, $p < .01$
Q.L8 : $F = 8.1$, $p < .01$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 19.2 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 15 and 95 df, = 1.5, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further analyses were conducted.

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 17.1 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 24 and 135 df, = 1.2, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a significant F value, no further data are presented.

Illustrative Tabulations

The following tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text. If a predictor variable was highly skewed or an analysis was based upon a small sub-sample, and hence it was unlikely to yield an observable difference in a cross-tabular format, it has been excluded from the following illustrative tables.

Table	Page
Awareness of Site Nutrition Education by Perception of Contribution Policy	J-5
Awareness of Site Nutrition Education by Frequency of Participation in Site Activities	J-6
Awareness of Site Nutrition Education by Frequency of Socializing at Site (Visiting With Friends)	J-7
Awareness of Site Nutrition Education by Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance	J-8
Awareness of Site Nutrition Education by General Mobility (Frequency of Getting Out of the House)	J-9
Awareness of Site Nutrition Education by Self-Rated Health Relative to Last Year's	J-10
Awareness of Site Nutrition Education by Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy	J-11
Awareness of Site Nutrition Education by Gender	J-12
Awareness of Site Nutrition Education by Minority Status	J-13
Awareness of Site Nutrition Education by Perceived Income Sufficiency	J-14

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E14 BY A10

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE
TOTAL	1211	339	179	642	187	72	569	152	107	573	178	101	638	161	78
YES	675	175	75	385	90	33	290	85	42	249	82	30	426	93	45
	56%	52%	42%	60%	48%	46%	51%	56%	39%	43%	46%	30%	67%	58%	58%
NO	326	106	70	157	60	27	169	46	43	195	58	44	131	48	26
	27%	31%	39%	25%	32%	37%	30%	30%	40%	34%	33%	43%	20%	30%	33%
DON'T KNOW	209	57	34	99	37	12	110	20	22	129	37	27	80	20	7
	17%	17%	19%	15%	20%	17%	19%	13%	21%	23%	21%	27%	13%	12%	9%
NO RESPONSE	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
	*	*	0	*	0	0	0	1%	0	0	0	0	*	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E14 BY B3

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN SITE ACTIVITIES

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER
TOTAL	480	529	449	239	283	230	241	246	219	198	248	244	282	281	205
YES	324	322	191	179	183	97	145	139	94	112	129	82	212	193	109
	68%	61%	43%	75%	65%	42%	60%	57%	43%	57%	52%	34%	75%	69%	53%
NO	103	131	130	40	62	63	63	69	67	54	75	83	49	56	47
	21%	25%	29%	17%	22%	27%	26%	28%	31%	27%	30%	34%	17%	20%	23%
DON'T KNOW	53	75	127	20	37	70	33	38	57	32	44	78	21	31	49
	11%	14%	28%	8%	13%	31%	14%	15%	26%	16%	18%	32%	8%	11%	24%
NO RESPONSE	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
	0	*	*	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	*	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E14 BY B4

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY FREQUENCY OF SOCIALIZING AT SITE

SITE PARTICIPANTS

	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME
TOTAL	737	571	423	376	311	213	361	260	210	313	274	267	424	297	156
YES	474	285	166	259	170	79	215	115	87	167	103	91	307	182	75
	64%	50%	39%	69%	55%	37%	60%	44%	42%	53%	38%	34%	73%	61%	48%
NO	166	180	158	74	88	82	92	92	76	84	107	108	82	73	50
	23%	32%	37%	20%	28%	39%	25%	35%	36%	27%	39%	40%	19%	25%	32%
DON'T KNOW	97	104	99	43	52	52	54	52	47	62	63	68	35	41	31
	13%	18%	24%	11%	17%	24%	15%	20%	22%	20%	23%	26%	8%	14%	20%
NO RESPONSE	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
	0	*	0	0	*	0	0	1%	0	0	*	0	0	*	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E14 BY B14

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE
TOTAL	911	476	451	279	460	197	404	230	507	246
YES	587 64%	200 42%	300 66%	135 49%	287 63%	65 33%	222 55%	71 31%	365 72%	129 53%
NO	196 22%	220 46%	93 21%	107 38%	103 22%	113 57%	107 26%	131 57%	89 18%	89 36%
DON'T KNOW	127 14%	55 12%	57 13%	37 13%	70 15%	18 9%	75 19%	27 12%	52 10%	28 11%
NO RESPONSE	1 *	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 1%	0 0	1 *	1 *	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E14 BY C1

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY GENERAL MOBILITY

(FREQUENCY OF GETTING OUT OF THE HOUSE)

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	1405	328	730	173	675	155	681	174	724	154
YES	780	145	426	82	354	63	307	54	473	91
	55%	44%	58%	47%	53%	41%	45%	31%	65%	59%
NO	390	115	186	60	204	55	224	75	166	40
	28%	35%	26%	35%	30%	35%	33%	43%	23%	26%
DON'T KNOW	233	68	117	31	116	37	149	45	84	23
	17%	21%	16%	18%	17%	24%	22%	26%	12%	15%
NO RESPONSE	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E14 BY D13

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY SELF-RATED CURRENT HEALTH RELATIVE TO LAST YEAR'S

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	BETTER	SAME	WORSE	BETTER	SAME	WORSE	BETTER	SAME	WORSE	BETTER	SAME	WORSE	BETTER	SAME	WORSE
TOTAL	337	1120	269	163	588	148	174	532	121	174	548	131	163	572	138
YES	187	600	135	95	333	78	92	267	57	81	230	50	106	370	85
	56%	54%	50%	58%	57%	53%	53%	50%	47%	46%	42%	38%	65%	[illegible]	[illegible]
NO	88	325	89	36	156	52	52	169	37	50	198	50	38	127	39
	26%	29%	33%	22%	26%	35%	30%	32%	31%	29%	36%	38%	23%	22%	28%
DON'T KNOW	61	195	44	31	99	18	30	96	26	43	120	30	18	75	14
	18%	17%	16%	19%	17%	12%	17%	18%	21%	25%	22%	23%	11%	13%	10%
NO RESPONSE	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
	*	0	1%	1%	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0	1%	1%	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E14 BY F9E

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY FREQUENCY OF FEELING DEPRESSED/VERY UNHAPPY

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER
TOTAL	488	433	793	255	207	431	233	226	362	257	215	372	231	218	421
YES	215	232	472	121	118	266	94	114	206	91	89	179	124	143	293
	44%	54%	60%	47%	57%	62%	40%	50%	57%	36%	41%	48%	54%	65%	70%
NO	170	114	215	91	46	106	79	68	109	100	69	125	70	45	90
	35%	26%	27%	36%	22%	24%	34%	30%	30%	39%	32%	34%	30%	21%	21%
DON'T KNOW	102	87	106	43	43	59	59	44	47	65	57	68	37	30	38
	21%	20%	13%	17%	21%	14%	25%	20%	13%	25%	27%	18%	16%	14%	9%
NO RESPONSE	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	*	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E14 BY L7

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY GENDER

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
TOTAL	473	1256	259	641	214	615	244	610	229	646
YES	219	702	124	381	95	321	89	271	130	431
	46%	56%	48%	59%	44%	52%	37%	45%	57%	67%
NO	159	346	82	164	77	182	89	210	70	136
	34%	28%	32%	26%	36%	30%	36%	34%	30%	21%
DON'T KNOW	95	206	53	95	42	111	66	128	29	78
	20%	16%	20%	15%	20%	18%	27%	21%	13%	12%
NO RESPONSE	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E14 BY L8

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY MINORITY STATUS

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY
TOTAL	321	1407	203	696	118	711	157	697	164	710
YES	156 49%	765 54%	105 52%	399 57%	51 43%	366 52%	50 32%	311 45%	106 65%	454 64%
NO	123 38%	381 27%	73 36%	173 25%	50 42%	208 29%	74 47%	224 32%	49 30%	157 22%
DON'T KNOW	42 13%	259 19%	25 12%	123 18%	17 15%	136 19%	33 21%	161 23%	9 5%	98 14%
NO RESPONSE	0 0	2 *	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 *

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E14 BY H2

AWARENESS OF SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY PERCEIVED INCOME SUFFICIENCY

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	VERY WELL	FAIRLY WELL	POORLY	VERY WELL	FAIRLY WELL	POORLY	VERY WELL	FAIRLY WELL	POORLY	VERY WELL	FAIRLY WELL	POORLY	VERY WELL	FAIRLY WELL	POORLY
TOTAL	578	905	228	293	471	127	285	434	101	273	446	126	305	459	102
YES	321	481	111	173	262	62	148	219	49	122	189	47	199	292	64
	55%	53%	49%	59%	56%	49%	52%	51%	48%	45%	43%	37%	65%	64%	63%
NO	177	258	63	79	131	36	98	127	27	98	152	45	79	106	18
	31%	29%	27%	27%	28%	28%	34%	29%	27%	36%	34%	36%	26%	23%	18%
DON'T KNOW	80	164	54	41	77	29	39	87	25	53	104	34	27	60	20
	14%	18%	24%	14%	16%	23%	14%	20%	25%	19%	23%	27%	9%	13%	19%
NO RESPONSE	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
	0	*	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	0	*	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX K

PARTICIPATION IN SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	K-2
Illustrative Tabulations	K-4

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were utilized to assess the relationships between elderly participation in site nutrition education and two sets of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 9.6 percent of the variance of participation, F, 15 and 1028 df, = 7.3, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A10 : $F = 5.5$, $p < .05$
Q.B2 : $F = 20.2$, $p < .01$
Q.B14 : $F = 4.1$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 5.6 percent of the variance of participation, F, 24 and 1439 df, = 3.5, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C1 : $F = 10.8$, $p < .01$
Q.F9e : $F = 4.0$, $p < .05$
Q.G5c : $F = 8.6$, $p < .01$
Q.L7 : $F = 6.9$, $p < .01$
Q.I6 : $F = 4.6$, $p < .05$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 19.5 percent of the variance of participation, F, 15 and 95 df, = 1.5, $p > .05$. Since the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further data are presented.

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 10.4 percent of the variance of participation, F, 24 and 187 df, = 0.9, $p > .05$. Because a significant F value did not obtain, no further data are presented.

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text. Tables are provided for those relationshps whose distributions were neither highly skewed nor based upon small sub-samples.

Table	Page
Participation in Site Nutrition Education by Perception of Contribution Policy	K-5
Participation in Site Nutrition Education by Awareness of Site Medical Assistance	K-6
Participation in Site Nutrition education by General Mobility (Frequency of Getting Out of the House)	K-7
Participation in Site Nutrition Education by Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy	K-8
Participation in Site Nutrition Education by Gender	K-9
Participation in Site Nutrition Education by Education	K-10

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E15 BY A10

PARTICIPATION IN SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY

BASE = THOSE WHERE SUCH IS AVAILABLE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE
TOTAL	1211	339	179	642	187	72	569	152	107	573	178	101	638	161	78
PERCENT ASKED	675 56%	175 52%	75 42%	385 60%	90 48%	33 46%	290 51%	85 56%	42 39%	249 43%	82 46%	30 30%	426 67%	93 58%	45 58%
YES	496 41%	123 36%	59 33%	290 45%	65 35%	25 35%	206 36%	58 38%	34 32%	161 28%	51 29%	22 22%	335 53%	72 45%	37 47%
NO	176 15%	51 15%	16 9%	93 14%	24 13%	8 11%	83 15%	27 18%	8 7%	87 15%	31 17%	8 8%	89 14%	20 12%	8 10%
DON'T KNOW	2 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0
NO RESPONSE	1 *	1 *	0 0	1 *	1 1%	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 *	1 1%	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E15 BY B14

PARTICIPATION IN SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE
TOTAL	911	476	451	279	460	197	404	230	507	246
PERCENT ASKED	587	200	300	135	287	65	222	71	365	129
	64%	42%	67%	48%	62%	33%	55%	31%	72%	52%
YES	435	146	230	101	205	45	143	46	292	100
	48%	31%	51%	36%	45%	23%	35%	20%	58%	41%
NO	149	54	68	34	81	20	78	25	71	29
	16%	11%	15%	12%	18%	10%	19%	11%	14%	12%
DON'T KNOW	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
	*	0	0	0	*	0	*	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
	*	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E15 BY C1

PARTICIPATION IN SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY GENERAL MOBILITY

(FREQUENCY OF GETTING OUT OF THE HOUSE)

BASE = THOSE WHERE SUCH IS AVAILABLE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	1405	328	730	173	675	155	681	174	724	154
PERCENT ASKED	780	145	426	82	354	63	307	54	473	91
	56%	44%	58%	47%	52%	41%	45%	31%	65%	59%
YES	576	102	316	64	260	38	200	34	376	68
	41%	31%	43%	37%	39%	25%	29%	20%	52%	44%
NO	201	42	108	17	93	25	106	20	95	22
	14%	13%	15%	10%	14%	16%	16%	11%	13%	14%
DON'T KNOW	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0
NO RESPONSE	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
	*	*	*	1%	0	0	0	0	*	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E15 BY F9E

PARTICIPATION IN SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY FREQUENCY OF FEELING DEPRESSED/VERY UNHAPPY

BASE = THOSE WHERE SUCH IS AVAILABLE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER
TOTAL	488	433	793	255	207	431	233	226	362	257	215	372	231	218	421
PERCENT ASKED	215	232	472	121	118	266	94	114	206	91	89	179	124	143	293
	44%	54%	60%	47%	57%	62%	40%	50%	57%	35%	41%	48%	54%	66%	70%
YES	148	174	352	87	93	198	61	81	154	55	59	118	93	115	234
	30%	40%	44%	34%	45%	46%	26%	36%	43%	21%	27%	32%	40%	53%	56%
NO	66	57	118	33	25	66	33	32	52	36	29	61	30	28	57
	14%	13%	15%	13%	12%	15%	14%	14%	14%	14%	13%	16%	13%	13%	14%
DON'T KNOW	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	0	*	*	0	0	*	0	*	0	0	*	0	0	0	*
NO RESPONSE	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	*	0	*	*	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II . .

QUESTION E15 BY L7

PARTICIPATION IN SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY GENDER

BASE = THOSE WHERE SUCH IS AVAILABLE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
TOTAL	473	1256	259	641	214	615	244	610	229	646
PERCENT ASKED	219 46%	702 56%	124 48%	381 59%	95 44%	321 52%	89 36%	271 44%	130 57%	431 67%
YES	149 32%	526 42%	83 32%	295 46%	66 31%	231 38%	54 22%	179 29%	95 41%	347 54%
NO	70 15%	172 14%	41 16%	83 13%	29 14%	89 14%	35 14%	91 15%	35 15%	81 13%
DON'T KNOW	0 0	2 *	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 *
NO RESPONSE	0 0	2 *	0 0	2 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 *

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION E15 BY I6

PARTICIPATION IN SITE NUTRITION EDUCATION BY EDUCATION

BASE = THOSE WHERE SUCH IS AVAILABLE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE	0 - 8 YEARS	9-12 YEARS	MORE
TOTAL	721	699	303	373	354	170	348	345	133	320	368	164	401	331	139
PERCENT ASKED	356 49%	391 56%	174 57%	202 54%	204 58%	99 58%	154 44%	187 54%	75 56%	114 36%	165 45%	81 49%	242 60%	226 68%	93 67%
YES	272 38%	281 40%	122 40%	154 41%	153 43%	70 41%	118 34%	128 37%	52 39%	83 26%	105 29%	46 28%	189 47%	176 53%	76 55%
NO	81 11%	109 16%	52 17%	46 12%	50 14%	29 17%	35 10%	59 17%	23 17%	30 9%	60 16%	35 21%	51 13%	49 15%	17 12%
DON'T KNOW	2 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0
NO RESPONSE	1 *	1 *	0 0	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 *	1 *	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX L

AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	L-2
Illustrative Tabulations	L-4

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were utilized to assess the relationships between awareness of site shopping assistance and two sets of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A1 : Frequency of Attendance
Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B5 : Pleasantness of Meal Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tasted Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 81.9 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 14 and 1029 df, = 331.9, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A1 : $F = 11.9$, $p < .01$
Q.B3 : $F = 6.6$, $p < .05$
Q.B14 : $F = 4.5$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 8.2 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 24 and 1419 df, = 5.3, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C1 : $F = 9.4$, $p < .01$
Q.E9 : $F = 5.6$, $p < .05$
Q.F2 : $F = 4.9$, $p < .05$
Q.F9e : $F = 7.2$, $p < .01$
Q.L7 : $F = 6.8$, $p < .01$
Isolation $F = 4.5$, $p < .05$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 92.2 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 14 and 96 df, = 80.6, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A1	$F = 6.8$, $p < .05$
Q.A10	$F = 5.8$, $p < .05$
Q.B5	$F = 4.0$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 17.0 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 24 and 180 df, = 1.5, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of variables did not yield a statistically F value, no further data are presented.

Results for Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 88.0 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 10 and 258 df, = 188.5, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.B14	$F = 36.4$, $p < .01$
Q.B15	$F = 16.8$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 11.5 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 23 and 218 df, = 1.2, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further data are presented.

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text. If a predictor variable's distribution was highly skewed or a relationship was based upon a small sample size, and thus, it was unlikely to reveal an observable relationship in a cross-tabular format, it has been excluded from these illustrative tables.

Table	Page
Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance by Frequency of Attendance	L-6
Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance by Perception of Contribution	L-7

Table	Page
Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance by Frequency of Participation in Site Activitie	L-8
Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance by Awareness of Site Medical Assistance	L-9
Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance by Use of Site Medical Assistance	L-10
Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance by General Mobility (Frequency of Getting Out of the House)	L-11
Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance by Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy	L-12
Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance by Gender	L-13
Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance by Isolation	L-14

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B11 BY A1

AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS																	
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM			FORMER		
	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	804	654	260	409	340	142	395	314	118	343	334	164	461	320	96	89	82	68
YES	239	135	29	111	71	12	128	64	17	92	66	19	147	69	10	18	9	7
	30%	21%	11%	27%	21%	9%	32%	20%	14%	27%	20%	12%	32%	21%	10%	20%	11%	10%
NO	559	504	226	296	267	128	263	237	98	247	255	141	312	249	85	71	69	59
	69%	77%	87%	72%	79%	90%	67%	76%	83%	72%	76%	86%	68%	78%	89%	80%	84%	87%
DON'T KNOW	6	13	5	2	1	2	4	12	3	4	11	4	2	2	1	0	4	2
	1%	2%	2%	1%	*	1%	1%	4%	3%	1%	3%	2%	*	1%	1%	0	5%	3%
NO RESPONSE	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	*	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B11 BY A10

AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY

	FORMER PARTICIPANTS		
	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE
TOTAL	148	64	25
YES	24 16%	6 9%	4 16%
NO	121 82%	57 89%	21 84%
DON'T KNOW	3 2%	1 2%	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B11 BY B3

AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN SITE ACTIVITIES

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER
TOTAL	480	529	449	239	283	230	241	246	219	198	248	244	282	281	205
YES	150 31%	122 23%	95 21%	69 29%	60 21%	44 19%	81 34%	62 25%	51 23%	60 30%	56 23%	45 18%	90 32%	66 24%	50 24%
NO	324 68%	401 76%	346 77%	168 70%	221 78%	183 80%	156 65%	180 73%	163 75%	133 67%	187 75%	194 80%	191 68%	214 76%	152 74%
DON'T KNOW	4 1%	6 1%	8 2%	1 1%	2 1%	3 1%	3 1%	4 2%	5 2%	3 2%	5 2%	5 2%	1 *	1 *	3 2%
NO RESPONSE	2 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0	2 1%	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B11 BY B14

AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS											
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM		HOME DELIVERED MEALS	
	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE
TOTAL	911	476	451	279	460	197	404	230	507	246	88	227
YES	275 30%	69 15%	128 28%	35 13%	147 32%	34 17%	111 27%	31 14%	164 32%	38 15%	35 40%	13 6%
NO	627 69%	405 85%	321 71%	243 87%	306 67%	162 82%	285 71%	197 86%	342 68%	208 85%	51 58%	213 94%
DON'T KNOW	8 1%	1 *	2 1%	0 0	6 1%	1 1%	7 2%	1 *	1 *	0 0	2 2%	1 *
NO RESPONSE	1 *	1 *	0 0	1 *	1 *	0 0	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B11 BY B15

AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY USE OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

	HOME DELIVERED MEALS	
	USE	DON'T USE
TOTAL	47	39
YES	23 49%	12 31%
NO	24 51%	26 67%
DON'T KNOW	0 0	1 2%
NO RESPONSE	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B11 BY C1

AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY GENERAL MOBILITY

(FREQUENCY OF GETTING OUT OF THE HOUSE)

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	1405	328	730	173	675	155	681	174	724	154
YES	333	72	148	47	185	25	151	28	182	44
	24%	22%	20%	27%	27%	16%	22%	16%	25%	28%
NO	1049	249	577	123	472	126	511	140	538	109
	75%	76%	79%	71%	70%	81%	75%	81%	74%	71%
DON'T KNOW	21	7	4	3	17	4	17	6	4	1
	1%	2%	1%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%	1%
NO RESPONSE	2	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B11 BY F9E

AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY FREQUENCY OF FEELING

DEPRESSED/VERY UNHAPPY

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER
TOTAL	488	433	793	255	207	431	233	226	362	257	215	372	231	218	421
YES	137	101	163	66	45	80	71	56	83	68	44	67	69	57	96
	28%	23%	21%	26%	22%	19%	31%	25%	23%	27%	21%	18%	30%	26%	23%
NO	342	324	618	185	162	347	157	162	271	181	164	296	161	160	322
	70%	75%	78%	72%	78%	80%	67%	72%	75%	70%	76%	80%	70%	73%	76%
DON'T KNOW	9	8	10	4	0	3	5	8	7	8	7	7	1	1	3
	2%	2%	1%	2%	0	1%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	*	1%	1%
NO RESPONSE	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0
	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B11 BY L7

AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY GENDER

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
TOTAL	473	1256	259	641	214	615	244	610	229	646
YES	79 17%	325 26%	40 16%	155 24%	39 18%	170 28%	35 14%	143 24%	44 19%	182 28%
NO	389 82%	906 72%	216 83%	481 75%	173 81%	425 69%	205 84%	446 73%	184 80%	460 71%
DON'T KNOW	5 1%	23 2%	3 1%	4 1%	2 1%	19 3%	4 2%	19 3%	1 1%	4 1%
NO RESPONSE	0 0	2 *	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 *	0 0	2 *	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B11 BY ISOLATION INDEX

AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY ISOLATION

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	LESS ISOL-ATED	MORE ISOL-ATED	EXTR-EMELY ISOL-ATED	LESS ISOL-ATED	MORE ISOL-ATED	EXTR-EMELY ISOL-ATED	LESS ISOL-ATED	MORE ISOL-ATED	EXTR-EMELY ISOL-ATED	LESS ISOL-ATED	MORE ISOL-ATED	EXTR-EMELY ISOL-ATED	LESS ISOL-ATED	MORE ISOL-ATED	EXTR-EMELY ISOL-ATED
TOTAL	438	285	297	226	142	149	212	143	148	224	127	156	214	158	141
YES	100	55	73	47	27	31	53	28	42	45	20	35	55	35	38
	23%	19%	24%	21%	19%	21%	25%	20%	28%	20%	16%	23%	26%	22%	27%
NO	331	226	219	178	113	117	153	113	102	173	104	116	158	122	103
	75%	79%	74%	79%	80%	78%	72%	79%	69%	77%	82%	74%	74%	77%	73%
DON'T KNOW	7	4	5	1	2	1	6	2	4	6	3	5	1	1	0
	2%	2%	2%	*	1%	1%	3%	1%	3%	3%	2%	3%	*	1%	0
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FOOTNOTE: INDEX VALUES RANGE FROM 5 TO 14
LESS ISOLATED = 5-7
MORE ISOLATED = 8
EXTREMELY ISOLATED = 9-14

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX M

UTILIZATION OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	M-2
Illustrative Tabulations	M-5

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were employed to assess the relationships between elderly awareness of site shopping assitance and two sets of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A1 : Frequency of Attendance
Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B5 : Pleasantness of Meal Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 81.4 percent of the variance of service utilization, F, 14 and 1029 df, = 321.5, $p < .01$. A significant univariate F value was found for the following variable in this regression equation:

Q.B3 : $F = 5.4$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 4.9 percent of the variance of service utilization, F, 24 and 1435 df, = 3.1, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C1 : $F = 6.8$, $p < .01$
Q.D12 : $F = 3.9$, $p < .05$
Q.F9e : $F = 5.2$, $p < .05$
Q.G6 : $F = 4.1$, $p < .05$
Q.L7 : $F = 4.2$, $p < .05$
Q.I9 : $F = 9.3$, $p < .01$
Isolation $F = 8.3$, $p < .01$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 92.4 percent of the variance of service utilization, F, 14 and 96 df, = 82.8, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A1	$F = 6.5$, $p < .05$
Q.A10	$F = 8.5$, $p < .01$
Q.B2	$F = 4.0$, $p < .05$
Q.B5	$F = 6.2$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 16.5 percent of the variance of service utilization, F, 24 and 187 df, = 1.5, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further data are presented.

Results for Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 86.5 percent of the variance of service utilization, F, 10 and 258 df, = 165.4, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.B14	$F = 15.8$, $p < .01$
Q.B15	$F = 10.0$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 8.3 percent of the variance of service utilization, F, 23 and 221 df, = 0.9, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further data are presented.

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text. If a predictor variable's distribution was highly skewed or a relationship was based upon a small sample size, and thus, it was unlikely to reveal an observable relationship in a cross-tabular format, it has been excluded from these illustrative tables.

Table	Page
Use of Site Shopping Assistance by Frequency of Socializing at Site	M-6
Use of Site Shopping Assistance by General Mobility (Frequency of Getting Out of the House)	M-7
Use of Site Shopping Assistance by Self-Rated Current Health	M-8
Use of Site Shopping Assistance by Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy	M-9
Use of Site Shopping Assistance by Membership in Clubs/Organizations	M-10
Use of Site Shopping Assistance by Gender	M-11
Use of Site Shopping Assistance by Annual (1981) Family Income	M-12
Use of Site Shopping Assistance by Isolation	M-13

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B13 BY B3

USE OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY FREQUENCY OF SOCIALIZING AT SITE

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY HELP IS OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	AL-WAYS	SOME-TIMES	RARELY/ NEVER	AL-WAYS	SOME-TIMES	RARELY/ NEVER	AL-WAYS	SOME-TIMES	RARELY/ NEVER	AL-WAYS	SOME-TIMES	RARELY/ NEVER	AL-WAYS	SOME-TIMES	RARELY/ NEVER
TOTAL	480	529	449	239	283	230	241	246	219	198	248	244	282	281	205
PERCENT ASKED	150 31%	122 23%	95 21%	69 29%	60 21%	44 19%	81 34%	62 25%	51 23%	60 30%	56 23%	45 18%	90 32%	66 23%	50 24%
WHENEVER OFFERED	63 13%	29 5%	17 4%	27 11%	15 5%	9 4%	36 15%	14 6%	8 4%	24 12%	12 5%	6 2%	39 14%	17 6%	11 5%
ONLY OCCASIONALLY	35 7%	38 7%	16 4%	14 6%	21 7%	7 3%	21 9%	17 7%	9 4%	11 6%	15 6%	4 2%	24 9%	23 8%	12 6%
NEVER USED	51 11%	54 10%	59 13%	28 12%	24 8%	25 11%	23 10%	30 12%	34 16%	24 12%	28 11%	34 14%	27 10%	26 9%	25 12%
DON'T KNOW	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 *
NO RESPONSE	1 *	1 *	2 *	0 0	0 0	2 1%	1 *	1 *	0 0	1 1%	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	1 *

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B13 BY C1

USE OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY GENERAL MOBILITY

(FREQUENCY OF GETTING OUT OF THE HOUSE)

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY HELP IS OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	1405	328	730	173	675	155	681	174	724	154
PERCENT ASKED	333 24%	72 22%	148 20%	47 27%	185 27%	25 16%	151 22%	28 16%	182 25%	44 29%
WHENEVER OFFERED	93 7%	28 9%	38 5%	17 10%	55 8%	11 7%	38 6%	8 5%	55 8%	20 13%
ONLY OCCASIONALLY	78 6%	15 5%	31 4%	11 6%	47 7%	4 3%	29 4%	3 2%	49 7%	12 8%
NEVER USED	155 11%	29 9%	74 10%	19 11%	81 12%	10 6%	79 12%	17 10%	76 10%	12 8%
DON'T KNOW	3 *	0 0	3 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 *	0 0	1 *	0 0
NO RESPONSE	4 *	0 0	2 *	0 0	2 *	0 0	3 *	0 0	1 *	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B13 BY D12

USE OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY SELF-RATED CURRENT HEALTH

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY HELP IS OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD/AVG	FAIR/POOR	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD/AVG	FAIR/POOR	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD/AVG	FAIR/POOR	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD/AVG	FAIR/POOR	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD/AVG	FAIR/POOR
TOTAL	220	1073	427	110	539	246	110	534	181	110	521	223	110	552	204
PERCENT ASKED	44	240	117	23	107	62	21	133	55	18	101	60	26	139	57
	20%	22%	27%	21%	20%	25%	19%	25%	30%	16%	19%	27%	24%	25%	28%
WHENEVER OFFERED	15	69	36	7	28	20	8	41	16	5	25	16	10	44	20
	7%	6%	8%	6%	5%	8%	7%	8%	9%	5%	5%	7%	9%	8%	10%
ONLY OCCASIONALLY	6	60	27	4	26	12	2	34	15	0	23	9	6	37	18
	3%	6%	6%	4%	5%	5%	2%	6%	8%	0	4%	4%	5%	7%	9%
NEVER USED	22	108	51	12	51	27	10	57	24	12	51	33	10	57	18
	10%	10%	12%	11%	9%	11%	9%	11%	13%	11%	10%	15%	9%	10%	9%
DON'T KNOW	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
	0	*	*	0	*	*	0	0	0	0	*	*	0	*	0
NO RESPONSE	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1
	*	*	*	0	0	1%	1%	*	0	1%	*	*	0	0	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B13 BY F9E

USE OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY FREQUENCY OF FEELING

DEPRESSED/VERY UNHAPPY

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY HELP IS OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER	OFTEN/ SOME-TIMES	RARELY	NEVER
TOTAL	488	433	793	255	207	431	233	226	362	257	215	372	231	218	421
PERCENT ASKED	137	101	163	66	45	80	71	56	83	68	44	67	69	57	96
	28%	23%	21%	26%	22%	19%	30%	25%	23%	26%	20%	18%	30%	26%	23%
WHENEVER OFFERED	41	30	49	18	12	24	23	18	25	17	11	18	24	19	31
	8%	7%	6%	7%	6%	6%	10%	8%	7%	7%	5%	5%	10%	9%	7%
ONLY OCCASIONALLY	34	19	38	15	6	19	19	13	19	11	7	14	23	12	24
	7%	4%	5%	6%	3%	4%	8%	6%	5%	4%	3%	4%	10%	6%	6%
NEVER USED	56	52	75	28	27	37	28	25	38	36	26	34	20	26	41
	11%	12%	9%	11%	13%	9%	12%	11%	10%	14%	12%	9%	9%	12%	10%
DON'T KNOW	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0
	1%	0	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0	*	0	0
NO RESPONSE	3	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0
	1%	0	*	1%	0	0	*	0	*	1%	0	*	*	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B13 BY G6

USE OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY MEMBERSHIP IN CLUBS/ORGANIZATIONS

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY HELP IS OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER
TOTAL	801	927	432	470	369	457	357	495	444	432
PERCENT ASKED	157 20%	246 27%	71 16%	124 26%	86 23%	122 27%	71 20%	107 22%	86 19%	139 32%
WHENEVER OFFERED	49 6%	72 8%	21 5%	34 7%	28 8%	38 8%	20 6%	26 5%	29 7%	46 11%
ONLY OCCASIONALLY	36 4%	57 6%	13 3%	29 6%	23 6%	28 6%	17 5%	15 3%	19 4%	42 10%
NEVER USED	70 9%	112 12%	36 8%	57 12%	34 9%	55 12%	33 9%	62 13%	37 8%	50 12%
DON'T KNOW	1 *	2 *	1 *	2 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 *	1 *	0 0
NO RESPONSE	1 *	3 *	0 0	2 *	1 *	1 *	1 *	2 *	0 0	1 *

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B13 BY L7

USE OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY GENDER

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY HELP IS OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
TOTAL	473	1256	259	641	214	615	244	610	229	646
PERCENT ASKED	79 17%	325 26%	40 15%	155 24%	39 18%	170 28%	35 14%	143 23%	44 19%	182 28%
WHENEVER OFFERED	16 3%	105 8%	7 3%	48 7%	9 4%	57 9%	5 2%	41 7%	11 5%	64 10%
ONLY OCCASIONALLY	12 3%	81 6%	5 2%	37 6%	7 3%	44 7%	5 2%	27 4%	7 3%	54 8%
NEVER USED	48 10%	135 11%	26 10%	67 10%	22 10%	68 11%	23 9%	72 12%	25 11%	63 10%
DON'T KNOW	1 *	2 *	1 *	2 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 *	1 *	0 0
NO RESPONSE	2 *	2 *	1 *	1 *	1 *	1 *	2 1%	1 *	0 0	1 *

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B13 BY I9

USE OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY HELP IS OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	LT $6K	$6K+	LT $6K	$6K+	LT $6K	$6K+	LT $6K	$6K+	LT $6K	$6K+
TOTAL	901	759	469	394	432	365	423	398	478	361
PERCENT ASKED	283	111	136	56	147	55	115	59	168	52
	31%	15%	29%	14%	34%	15%	27%	15%	35%	14%
WHENEVER OFFERED	103	15	47	7	56	8	38	7	65	8
	11%	2%	10%	2%	13%	2%	9%	2%	14%	2%
ONLY OCCASIONALLY	68	23	31	11	37	12	21	10	47	13
	8%	3%	7%	3%	9%	3%	5%	3%	10%	4%
NEVER USED	108	71	55	36	53	35	53	41	55	30
	12%	9%	12%	9%	12%	10%	13%	10%	12%	8%
DON'T KNOW	1	2	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	1
	*	*	*	1%	0	0	*	*	0	*
NO RESPONSE	3	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0
	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B13 BY ISOLATION INDEX

USE OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE BY ISOLATION

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	LESS ISOL-ATED	MORE ISOL-ATED	EXTR-EMELY ISOL-ATED	LESS ISOL-ATED	MORE ISOL-ATED	EXTR-EMELY ISOL-ATED	LESS ISOL-ATED	MORE ISOL-ATED	EXTR-EMELY ISOL-ATED	LESS ISOL-ATED	MORE ISOL-ATED	EXTR-EMELY ISOL-ATED	LESS ISOL-ATED	MORE ISOL-ATED	EXTR-EMELY ISOL-ATED
TOTAL	438	285	297	226	142	149	212	143	148	224	127	156	214	158	141
PERCENT ASKED	100	55	73	47	27	31	53	28	42	45	20	35	55	35	38
	23%	19%	25%	21%	19%	21%	25%	20%	28%	20%	16%	22%	26%	22%	27%
WHENEVER OFFERED	26	15	28	14	8	9	12	7	19	12	2	12	14	13	16
	6%	5%	9%	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%	13%	5%	2%	8%	7%	8%	11%
ONLY OCCASIONALLY	24	12	16	11	5	9	13	7	7	10	5	3	14	7	13
	5%	4%	5%	5%	4%	6%	6%	5%	5%	4%	4%	2%	7%	4%	9%
NEVER USED	49	27	27	21	14	11	28	13	16	22	12	19	27	15	8
	11%	9%	9%	9%	10%	7%	13%	9%	11%	10%	9%	12%	13%	9%	6%
DON'T KNOW	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0	0	1%	0	0	1%	0	0	0	0	0	1%	0	0	1%
NO RESPONSE	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
	*	*	0	*	0	0	0	1%	0	*	1%	0	0	0	0

FOOTNOTE: INDEX VALUES RANGE FROM 5 TO 14
LESS ISOLATED = 5-7
MORE ISOLATED = 8
EXTREMELY ISOLATED = 9-14

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX N

AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	N-2
Illustrative Tabulations	N-5

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were utilized to assess the relationships between elderly awareness of site medical activities and two sets of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tasted Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 76.6 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 14 and 1029 df, = 240.3, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A10 : $F = 6.3$, $p < .05$
Q.B2 : $F = 7.5$, $p < .01$
Q.B4 : $F = 8.4$, $p < .01$
Q.B11 : $F = 4.5$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 8.1 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 24 and 1163 df, = 4.3, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C1 : $F = 7.9$, $p < .01$
Q.D12 : $F = 6.2$, $p < .05$
Q.F2 : $F = 8.6$, $p < .01$
Q.I1 : $F = 3.9$, $p < .05$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 81.6 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 14 and 96 df, = 30.3, $p < .01$. A significant univariate F value was found for the following variable in this regression equation:

Q.B15 $F = 296.7$, $p < .01$

This relationship indicates that those who utilized the service were very likely to be aware of its availability. Because no significant univariate F values did obtain for other factors in this set, no further data are presented.

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 26.9 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 24 and 140 df, = 2.1, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.D12 $F = 4.3$, $p < .05$
Q.I9 $F = 11.0$, $p < .01$

Results for Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 88.4 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 10 and 258 df, = 197.3, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A8 $F = 5.5$, $p < .05$
Q.B11 $F = 36.4$, $p < .01$
Q.B13 $F = 15.8$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 13.7 percent of the variance of awareness, F, 23 and 164 df, = 1.1, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further data are presented.

Illustrative Tabulations

The following tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text. If a given a predictor variable was highly skewed or an analysis was based upon a small sub-sample, and hence it was unlikely to yield an observable difference in a cross-tabular format, it has been excluded from the following illustrative table.

Table	Page
Awareness of Site Medical Assistance by Perception of Contribution Policy	N-6
Awareness of Site Medical Assistance by Frequency of Socializing at Site	N-7
Awareness of Site Medical Assistance by Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance	N-8,9
Awareness of Site Medical Assistance by General Mobility (Frequency of Getting Out of the House)	N-10
Awareness of Site Medical Assistance by Self-Rated Current Health	N-11
Awareness of Site Medical Assistance by Looking Forward to Something Next Week	N-12
Awareness of Site Medical Assistance by Marital Status	N-13

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B14 BY A10

AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY PERCEPTION OF CONTRIBUTION POLICY

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE	DON-ATION	CHARGE	FREE
TOTAL	1211	339	179	642	187	72	569	152	107	573	178	101	638	161	78
YES	670	162	77	347	80	23	323	82	54	289	79	35	381	83	42
	55%	48%	43%	54%	43%	32%	57%	54%	50%	50%	44%	34%	60%	51%	54%
NO	304	110	60	186	63	29	118	47	31	135	59	34	169	51	26
	25%	32%	33%	29%	34%	40%	21%	31%	29%	24%	33%	34%	26%	32%	33%
DON'T KNOW	236	66	41	109	44	19	127	22	22	148	39	31	88	27	10
	20%	20%	23%	17%	23%	26%	22%	14%	21%	26%	22%	31%	14%	17%	13%
NO RESPONSE	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
	*	*	1%	0	0	2%	*	1%	0	*	1%	1%	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION - WAVE II

QUESTION B14 BY B4

AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY FREQUENCY OF SOCIALIZING AT SITE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME
TOTAL	737	571	423	376	311	213	361	260	210	313	274	267	424	297	156
YES	440	281	187	209	150	90	231	131	97	178	118	106	262	163	81
	60%	49%	44%	55%	48%	42%	64%	50%	46%	57%	43%	40%	62%	55%	52%
NO	177	158	141	112	88	79	65	70	62	69	75	86	108	83	55
	24%	28%	33%	30%	28%	37%	18%	27%	30%	22%	28%	32%	25%	28%	35%
DON'T KNOW	120	131	93	55	72	44	65	59	49	66	80	73	54	51	20
	16%	23%	22%	15%	23%	21%	18%	23%	23%	21%	29%	27%	13%	17%	13%
NO RESPONSE	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0
	0	*	1%	0	1%	0	0	0	1%	0	*	1%	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B14 BY B11

AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE
TOTAL	405	1300	195	700	210	600	179	653	226	647
YES	275	627	128	321	147	306	111	285	164	342
	68%	48%	66%	46%	70%	51%	62%	44%	72%	53%
NO	69	405	35	243	34	162	31	197	38	208
	17%	31%	18%	35%	16%	27%	17%	30%	17%	32%
DON'T KNOW	61	265	32	135	29	130	37	168	24	97
	15%	21%	16%	19%	14%	22%	21%	26%	11%	15%
NO RESPONSE	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	0
	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

QUESTION B14 BY B11

AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE

	HOME DELIVERED MEALS	
	AWARE	NOT AWARE
TOTAL	64	342
YES	35 55%	51 15%
NO	13 20%	213 62%
DON'T KNOW	16 25%	78 23%
NO RESPONSE	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B14 BY C1

AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY GENERAL MOBILITY

(FREQUENCY OF GETTING OUT OF THE HOUSE)

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	1405	328	730	173	675	155	681	17[illegible]	724	154
YES	769 55%	142 43%	379 52%	72 42%	390 58%	70 45%	339 50%	65 3[illegible]%	430 59%	77 50%
NO	360 26%	115 35%	213 29%	66 38%	147 22%	49 32%	171 25%	58 3[illegible]%	189 26%	57 37%
DON'T KNOW	273 19%	71 22%	137 19%	35 20%	136 20%	36 23%	168 25%	51 29%	105 15%	20 13%
NO RESPONSE	3 *	0 0	1 *	0 0	2 *	0 0	3 *	0 0	0 0	0 0

N-10

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B14 BY D12

AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY SELF-RATED CURRENT HEALTH

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD/ AVG	FAIR/ POOR	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD/ AVG	FAIR/ POOR	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD/ AVG	FAIR/ POOR	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD/ AVG	FAIR/ POOR	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD/ AVG	FAIR/ POOR
TOTAL	220	1073	427	110	539	246	110	534	181	110	521	223	110	552	204
YES	131	588	190	64	285	101	67	303	89	64	254	86	67	334	104
	60%	55%	44%	58%	53%	41%	61%	57%	49%	58%	49%	39%	61%	60%	51%
NO	49	268	152	27	150	99	22	118	53	20	127	83	29	141	69
	22%	25%	36%	25%	28%	40%	20%	22%	29%	18%	24%	37%	26%	26%	34%
DON'T KNOW	39	216	84	19	104	45	20	112	39	25	139	53	14	77	31
	18%	20%	20%	17%	19%	18%	18%	21%	22%	23%	27%	24%	13%	14%	15%
NO RESPONSE	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
	*	*	*	0	0	1%	1%	*	0	1%	*	*	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B14 BY F2

AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY LOOKING FORWARD TO SOMETHING NEXT WEEK

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	LOOKING FORWARD	NOT	LOOKING FORWARD	NOT	LOOKING FORWARD	NOT	LOOKING FORWARD	NOT	LOOKING FORWARD	NOT
TOTAL	863	870	470	432	393	438	396	460	467	410
YES	506	404	252	198	254	206	223	181	283	223
	59%	47%	54%	46%	65%	47%	56%	39%	61%	55%
NO	196	279	126	153	70	126	70	159	126	120
	23%	32%	27%	35%	18%	29%	18%	35%	27%	29%
DON'T KNOW	160	185	91	81	69	104	102	118	58	67
	18%	21%	19%	19%	17%	24%	26%	26%	12%	16%
NO RESPONSE	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0
	*	*	*	0	0	*	*	*	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

QUESTION B14 BY I1

AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY MARITAL STATUS

(NOT MARRIED CATEGORY INCLUDES SEPARATED, WIDOWED, DIVORCED, AND NEVER MARRIED)

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MARRIED	NOT MARRIED	MARRIED	NOT MARRIED	MARRIED	NOT MARRIED	MARRIED	NOT MARRIED	MARRIED	NOT MARRIED
TOTAL	596	1139	328	575	268	564	296	561	300	578
YES	343 58%	568 50%	179 54%	272 47%	164 61%	296 52%	154 52%	250 45%	189 63%	318 55%
NO	137 23%	339 30%	84 26%	195 34%	53 20%	144 26%	69 23%	161 29%	68 23%	178 31%
DON'T KNOW	115 19%	230 20%	65 20%	107 19%	50 19%	123 22%	72 24%	148 26%	43 14%	82 14%
NO RESPONSE	1 *	2 *	0 0	1 *	1 *	1 *	1 1%	2 *	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX O

UTILIZATION OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	O-2
Illustrative Tabulations	O-5

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were employed to assess the relationships between elderly utilization of site medical assitance and two sets of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping - Shopping Assitance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9. Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 75.7 percent of the variance of utilization of site medical assistance, F, 14 and 1029 df, = 229.5, $p < .01$. A significant univariate F value was found for the following variable in this regression equation:

Q.B14 : $F = 2912.1$, $p < .01$

This finding indicates logically, that those who were aware of the service utilized it. Since other significant univariate F values did not obtain, no further data are presented.

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 5.2 percent of the variance of utilization, F, 24 and 1435 df, = 3.3, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.E6 : $F = 3.9$, $p < .05$
Q.F2 : $F = 4.5$, $p < .05$
Q.G5c : $F = 4.0$, $p < .05$
Q.G6 : $F = 4.0$, $p < .05$
Q.I1 : $F = 5.6$, $p < .05$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 80.7 percent of the variance of utilization, F, 14 and 96 df, = 28.6, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.B14 $F = 296.7$, $p < .01$

This demonstrates the finding that those who were aware of the service utilized it. Since other significant univariate F values did not obtain, no further data are presented.

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 19.6 percent of the variance of utilization, F, 24 and 186 df, = 1.88, $p < .05$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this equation.

Q.F2 $F = 5.3$, $p < .05$
Q.I6 $F = 4.7$, $p < .05$
Q.I9 $F = 4.2$, $p < .05$

Results for Home-Delivered Meal Recipients

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 86.9 percent of the variance of utilization, F, 10 and 258 df, = 171.3, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.B11 $F = 16.8$, $p < .01$
Q.B13 $F = 10.0$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 9.3 percent of the variance of utilization, F, 23 and 220 df, = 1.0, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further data are presented.

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text. If a predictor variable's distribution was highly skewed or a relationship was based upon a small sample size, and thus, it was unlikely that an observable relationship would be yielded in a cross-tabular format, the table has been excluded from the illustrative tables.

Table	Page
Use of Site Medical Assistance by Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance	O-6
Use of Site Shopping Assistance by Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat (At the Respondent's House)	O-7
Use of Site Medical Assistance by Encouragement to Attend Site	O-8
Use of Site Medical Assistance by Membership in Clubs/Orgaizations	O-9
Use of Site Medical Assistance by Marital Status	O-10

QUESTION B15 BY B11/HB5

USE OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY MEDICAL HELP OFFERED

	HOME DELIVERED MEALS	
	AWARE	NOT AWARE
TOTAL	64	342
PERCENT ASKED	35 55%	51 15%
YES	23 36%	24 7%
NO	12 19%	26 8%
NO RESPONSE	0 0	1 *

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B15 BY E6

USE OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY FREQUENCY OF INVITING OTHERS TO EAT

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY MEDICAL HELP OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER	OFTEN	SOME-TIMES	RAR-ELY/ NEVER
TOTAL	293	586	849	153	303	443	140	283	406	149	281	421	144	305	428
PERCENT ASKED	179	331	396	79	167	202	100	164	194	90	133	177	89	198	219
	61%	56%	47%	52%	55%	46%	71%	58%	48%	60%	47%	42%	62%	65%	51%
YES	93	161	220	43	84	113	50	77	107	42	57	92	51	104	128
	32%	27%	26%	28%	28%	26%	36%	27%	26%	28%	20%	22%	35%	34%	30%
NO	81	168	175	34	82	89	47	86	86	47	75	84	34	93	91
	28%	29%	21%	22%	27%	20%	34%	30%	21%	32%	27%	20%	24%	30%	21%
NO RESPONSE	5	2	1	2	1	0	3	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	0
	2%	*	*	1%	*	0	2%	*	*	1%	*	*	3%	*	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B15 BY GSC

USE OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY ENCOURAGEMENT TO ATTEND SITE

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY MEDICAL HELP OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED
TOTAL	228	661	136	329	92	332	113	267	115	394
PERCENT ASKED	112 49%	394 60%	60 44%	184 56%	52 57%	210 63%	50 44%	153 57%	62 54%	241 61%
YES	63 28%	211 32%	33 24%	102 31%	30 33%	109 33%	31 27%	66 25%	32 28%	145 37%
NO	46 20%	180 27%	26 19%	81 25%	20 22%	99 30%	19 17%	85 32%	27 23%	95 24%
NO RESPONSE	3 1%	3 *	1 1%	1 *	2 2%	2 1%	0 0	2 1%	3 3%	1 *

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B15 BY G6

USE OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY MEMBERSHIP IN CLUBS/ORGANIZATIONS

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY MEDICAL HELP OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER	MEMBER	NOT A MEMBER
TOTAL	801	927	432	470	369	457	357	495	444	432
PERCENT ASKED	458 57%	450 49%	243 56%	210 45%	218 59%	240 53%	187 52%	216 44%	271 61%	234 54%
YES	235 29%	239 26%	124 29%	117 25%	111 30%	122 27%	80 22%	111 22%	155 35%	128 30%
NO	219 27%	207 22%	115 27%	91 19%	104 28%	116 25%	106 30%	103 21%	113 25%	104 24%
NO RESPONSE	4 *	4 *	1 *	2 *	3 1%	2 *	1 *	2 *	3 1%	2 *

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B15 BY I1

USE OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY MARITAL STATUS

(NOT MARRIED CATEGORY INCLUDES SEPARATED, WIDOWED, DIVORCED, AND NEVER MARRIED)

BASE = THOSE WHO SAY MEDICAL HELP OFFERED

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MAR-RIED	NOT MAR-RIED	MAR-RIED	NOT MAR-RIED	MAR-RIED	NOT MAR-RIED	MAR-RIED	NOT MAR-RIED	MAR-RIED	NOT MAR-RIED
TOTAL	596	1139	328	575	268	564	296	561	300	578
PERCENT ASKED	343	568	179	272	164	296	154	250	189	318
	58%	50%	55%	47%	61%	52%	52%	45%	63%	55%
YES	163	313	93	149	70	164	66	126	97	187
	27%	27%	28%	26%	26%	29%	22%	22%	32%	32%
NO	175	252	83	123	92	129	86	123	89	129
	29%	22%	25%	21%	34%	23%	29%	22%	30%	22%
NO RESPONSE	5	3	3	0	2	3	2	1	3	2
	1%	*	1%	0	1%	1%	1%	*	1%	*

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX P

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN SITE ACTIVITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	P-2
Illustrative Tabulations	P-5

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were employed to assess the relationships between frequency of participation in site activities and two sets of variables. Separate analyses were conducted for each set of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A1 : Frequency of Attendance
Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping - Shopping Assitance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 44.8 percent of the variance of frequency with which elderly participated in site activities, F, 14 and 1029 df, = 59.6, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A1 : $F = 16.1$, $p < .01$
Q.B4 : $F = 111.8$, $p < .01$
Q.B11 : $F = 6.6$, $p < .05$
Q.B13 : $F = 5.4$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 2.9 percent of the variance of participation frequency, F, 24 and 1421 df, = 1.78, $p < .05$. A significant univariate F value was found for the following variable in this equation:

Q.L8 : $F = 11.8$, $p < .01$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 60.3 percent of the variance of participation frequency, F, 14 and 96 df, = 10.4, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A1	$F = 6.5$, $p < .05$
Q.B4	$F = 17.7$, $p < .01$
Q.B10	$F = 6.5$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 9.9 percent of the variance of participation frequency, F, 24 and 186 df, = 0.9, $p > .05$. Because the optimally weighted combination of independent variables did not yield a statistically significant F value, no further data are presented.

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text. If a predictor variable's distribution was highly skewed or if a relationship was based upon a small sample size, and thus, it was unlikely to yield an observable relationship in a cross-tabular format, the table has been excluded from the following illustrative tables.

Table	Page
Frequency of Participation in Site Activities by Frequency of Attendance	P-6
Frequency of Participation in Site Activities by Frequency of Socializing at Site (Visiting Friends)	P-7
Frequency of Participation in Site Activities by Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance	P-8
Frequency of Participation in Site Activities by Minority Status	P-9

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B3 BY A1

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN SITE ACTIVITIES BY FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS																	
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM			FORMER		
	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN	4-5 TIMES PER WEEK	1-3 TIMES PER WEEK	LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	804	654	260	409	340	142	395	314	118	343	334	164	461	320	96	89	82	68
PERCENT ASKED	686	576	214	348	300	114	338	276	100	281	285	132	405	291	82	75	71	47
	85%	88%	82%	85%	88%	80%	86%	88%	85%	82%	85%	80%	88%	91%	85%	84%	87%	69%
ALWAYS	286	168	26	152	72	15	134	96	11	101	82	15	185	86	11	20	15	3
	36%	26%	10%	37%	21%	11%	34%	31%	9%	29%	25%	9%	40%	27%	11%	22%	18%	4%
SOMETIMES	228	238	62	117	134	31	111	104	31	103	111	33	125	127	29	27	30	12
	28%	36%	24%	29%	39%	22%	28%	33%	26%	30%	33%	20%	27%	40%	30%	30%	37%	18%
RARELY	61	59	32	30	29	17	31	30	15	24	31	16	37	28	16	6	10	6
	8%	9%	12%	7%	9%	12%	8%	10%	13%	7%	9%	10%	8%	9%	17%	7%	12%	9%
NEVER	101	99	91	42	58	49	59	41	42	52	50	66	49	49	25	22	16	24
	13%	15%	35%	10%	17%	35%	15%	13%	36%	15%	15%	40%	11%	15%	26%	25%	20%	35%
DON'T KNOW	1	4	1	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
	*	1%	*	0	1%	1%	*	0	0	0	1%	1%	*	0	0	0	0	1%
NO RESPONSE	9	8	2	7	3	1	2	5	1	1	7	1	8	1	1	0	0	1
	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	*	2%	1%	2%	*	1%	0	0	1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B3 BY B4

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN SITE ACTIVITIES BY FREQUENCY OF SOCIALIZING AT SITE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS																	
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM			FORMER		
	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME	A LOT OF TIME	SOME TIME	A BIT/ NO TIME
TOTAL	737	571	423	376	311	213	361	260	210	313	274	267	424	297	156	58	82	104
PERCENT ASKED	681 92%	487 85%	314 74%	344 91%	270 87%	154 72%	337 93%	217 83%	160 76%	280 89%	226 82%	197 74%	401 95%	261 88%	117 75%	54 93%	69 84%	74 71%
ALWAYS	327 44%	118 21%	35 8%	164 44%	59 19%	16 8%	163 45%	59 23%	19 9%	123 39%	56 20%	19 7%	204 48%	62 21%	16 10%	19 33%	16 20%	3 3%
SOMETIMES	230 31%	205 36%	94 22%	114 30%	125 40%	44 21%	116 32%	80 31%	50 24%	107 34%	83 30%	58 22%	123 29%	122 41%	36 23%	25 43%	30 37%	16 15%
RARELY	46 6%	57 10%	50 12%	21 6%	30 10%	26 12%	25 7%	27 10%	24 11%	16 5%	28 10%	28 10%	30 7%	29 10%	22 14%	5 9%	9 11%	8 8%
NEVER	67 9%	96 17%	132 31%	36 10%	50 16%	67 31%	31 9%	46 18%	65 31%	29 9%	53 19%	89 33%	38 9%	43 14%	43 28%	5 9%	14 17%	45 43%
DON'T KNOW	3 *	1 *	1 *	2 1%	1 *	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	2 1%	1 *	1 *	1 *	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 1%
NO RESPONSE	8 1%	10 2%	2 *	7 2%	5 2%	0 0	1 *	5 2%	2 1%	3 1%	5 2%	2 1%	5 1%	5 2%	0	0 0	0 0	1 1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B3 BY B11

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN SITE ACTIVITIES BY AWARENESS OF SITE SHOPPING ASSISTANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE
TOTAL	405	1300	195	700	210	600	179	653	226	647
PERCENT ASKED	371	1093	176	587	195	506	163	527	208	566
	92%	84%	90%	84%	93%	84%	91%	81%	92%	87%
ALWAYS	150	324	69	168	81	156	60	133	90	191
	37%	25%	35%	24%	39%	26%	34%	20%	40%	30%
SOMETIMES	122	401	60	221	62	180	56	187	66	214
	30%	31%	31%	32%	30%	30%	31%	29%	29%	33%
RARELY	40	111	19	56	21	55	12	59	28	52
	10%	9%	10%	8%	10%	9%	7%	9%	12%	8%
NEVER	55	235	25	127	30	108	33	135	22	100
	14%	18%	13%	18%	14%	18%	18%	21%	10%	15%
DON'T KNOW	0	7	0	6	0	1	0	6	0	1
	0	1%	0	1%	0	*	0	1%	0	*
NO RESPONSE	4	15	3	9	1	6	2	7	2	8
	1%	1%	2%	1%	*	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B3 BY L8

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN SITE ACTIVITIES BY MINORITY STATUS

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	NON-MINORITY
TOTAL	321	1407	203	696	118	711	157	697	164	710
PERCENT ASKED	250 78%	1228 87%	148 73%	618 89%	102 86%	610 86%	112 71%	591 85%	138 84%	637 90%
ALWAYS	98 31%	380 27%	62 31%	176 25%	36 31%	204 29%	36 23%	161 23%	62 38%	219 31%
SOMETIMES	89 28%	436 31%	54 27%	227 33%	35 30%	209 29%	42 27%	204 29%	47 29%	232 33%
RARELY	18 6%	135 10%	7 3%	70 10%	11 9%	65 9%	12 8%	60 9%	6 4%	75 11%
NEVER	35 11%	260 18%	18 9%	134 19%	17 14%	126 18%	16 10%	156 22%	19 12%	104 15%
DON'T KNOW	5 2%	2 *	4 2%	2 *	1 1%	0 0	4 3%	2 *	1 1%	0 0
NO RESPONSE	5 2%	15 1%	3 1%	9 1%	2 2%	6 1%	2 1%	8 1%	3 2%	7 1%

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX Q

FREQUENCY OF SOCIALIZING AT SITES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Multivariate Analyses	Q-2
Illustrative Tabulations	Q-5

Multivariate Analyses

Multiple regressions were used to assess the relationships between frequency of participation in site activities and two sets of variables. Separate analyses were conducted for each set of variables.

Independent Variable Set #1

Q.A1 : Frequency of Attendance
Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B5 : Pleasantness of Meal Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping - Shopping Assitance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance

Independent Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Services to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Independent Variable Set #2 (Continued)

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results for Congregate Dining Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 22.3 percent of the variance of socializing frequency, F, 14 and 1029 df, = 21.1, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A1 : $F = 17.4$, $p < .01$
Q.A10 : $F = 5.7$, $p < .05$
Q.B2 : $F = 96.9$, $p < .01$
Q.B3 : $F = 111.8$, $p < .01$
Q.B14 : $F = 8.4$, $p < .01$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 6.4 percent of the variance of socializing frequency, F, 24 and 1437 df, = 4.1, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.C1 : $F = 5.6$, $p < .05$
Q.E8 : $F = 5.8$, $p < .05$
Q.G5c : $F = 22.9$, $p < .01$
Q.L7 : $F = 6.8$, $p < .01$

Results for Former Participants

The regression equation for independent variable set #1 accounted for 34.0 percent of the variance of socializing frequency, F, 14 and 96 df, = 3.5, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.A10a	$F = 5.7$, $p < .05$
Q.B2	$F = 9.9$, $p < .01$
Q.B3	$F = 17.6$, $p < .01$
Q.B5	$F = 5.0$, $p < .05$

The regression equation for independent variable set #2 accounted for 20.9 percent of the variance of socializing frequency, F, 24 and 183 df, = 2.0, $p < .01$. Significant univariate F values were found for each of the following variables in this regression equation:

Q.E1	$F = 3.9$, $p < .05$
Q.E6	$F = 10.1$, $p < .01$
Q.F9e	$F = 5.2$, $p < .05$
Q.G5c	$F = 3.9$, $p < .05$

Illustrative Tabulations

The following bivariate tables are designed to illustrate multivariate findings discussed in the text. If a predictor variable's distribution was highly skewed or if a relationship was based upon a small sample size, and thus, it was unlikely to yield an observable relationship in a cross-tabular format, the table has been excluded from the following illustrative tables.

Table	Page
Frequency of Past Socializing at Site by Increased Donation	Q-6
Frequency of Socializing at Site by Frequency of Participating in Site Activities	Q-7
Frequency of Socializing at Site by Awareness of Site Medical Assistance	Q-8
Time Spent Socializing at Site by General Mobility (Frequency of Getting Out of the House)	Q-9
Time Spent Socializing at Site by Encouragement to Attend	Q-10
Time Spent Socializing at Site by Gender	Q-11

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B4 BY A10A

FREQUENCY OF PAST SOCIALIZING AT SITE BY INCREASED DONATION

	FORMER PARTICIPANTS	
	INCREASED	DIDN'T INCREASE
TOTAL	50	148
A LOT OF TIME	12 24%	30 20%
SOME TIME	21 42%	47 32%
JUST A LITTLE	14 28%	45 30%
NO TIME	3 6%	25 17%
DON'T KNOW	0 0	1 1%
NO RESPONSE	0 0	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION 94 BY B3

FREQUENCY OF SOCIALIZING AT SITE BY FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATING IN SITE ACTIVITIES

	SITE PARTICIPANTS														
	TOTAL			POST-1975 SITES			PRE-1975 SITES			RECENT ENTRY			LONGER TERM		
	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER
TOTAL	480	529	449	239	283	230	241	246	219	198	248	244	282	281	205
A LOT OF TIME	327	230	113	164	114	57	163	116	56	123	107	45	204	123	68
	68%	44%	25%	69%	40%	25%	68%	47%	26%	62%	43%	19%	72%	44%	33%
SOME TIME	118	205	153	59	125	80	59	80	73	56	83	81	62	122	72
	25%	39%	34%	25%	44%	35%	24%	33%	33%	28%	34%	33%	22%	43%	35%
JUST A LITTLE	30	81	141	11	37	75	19	44	66	17	48	88	13	33	53
	6%	15%	32%	4%	13%	32%	8%	18%	30%	9%	19%	36%	5%	12%	26%
NO TIME	5	13	41	5	7	18	0	6	23	2	10	29	3	3	12
	1%	2%	9%	2%	3%	8%	0	2%	11%	1%	4%	12%	1%	1%	6%
DON'T KNOW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B4 BY B14

FREQUENCY OF SOCIALIZING AT SITE BY AWARENESS OF SITE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE	AWARE	NOT AWARE
TOTAL	911	476	451	279	460	197	404	230	507	246
A LOT OF TIME	440	177	209	112	231	65	178	69	262	108
	48%	37%	47%	40%	50%	33%	44%	30%	52%	44%
SOME TIME	281	158	150	88	131	70	118	75	163	83
	31%	33%	33%	32%	29%	36%	29%	32%	32%	34%
JUST A LITTLE	156	100	76	54	80	46	82	59	74	41
	17%	21%	17%	19%	17%	23%	21%	26%	15%	16%
NO TIME	31	41	14	25	17	16	24	27	7	14
	4%	9%	3%	9%	4%	8%	6%	12%	1%	6%
DON'T KNOW	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	*	0	*	0	0	0	*	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B4 BY C1

TIME SPENT SOCIALIZING AT SITE BY GENERAL MOBILITY

(FREQUENCY OF GETTING OUT OF THE HOUSE)

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN	LEAVE HOUSE DAILY	LEAVE HOUSE LESS OFTEN
TOTAL	1405	328	730	173	675	155	681	174	724	154
A LOT OF TIME	625	112	313	63	312	49	261	52	364	60
	45%	34%	43%	36%	46%	32%	38%	30%	50%	39%
SOME TIME	442	128	244	67	198	61	208	65	234	63
	31%	39%	34%	39%	29%	39%	31%	37%	32%	41%
JUST A LITTLE	266	67	133	31	133	36	159	42	107	25
	19%	21%	18%	18%	20%	23%	23%	24%	15%	16%
NO TIME	69	20	38	11	31	9	51	14	18	6
	5%	6%	5%	6%	5%	6%	8%	8%	3%	4%
DON'T KNOW	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
	*	*	*	1%	0	0	*	1%	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B4 BY G5C

TIME SPENT SOCIALIZING AT SITE BY ENCOURAGEMENT TO ATTEND

	SITE PARTICIPANTS											
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM		FORMER PARTICIPANTS	
	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED	ENCOURAGED	NOT ENCOURAGED
TOTAL	228	661	136	329	92	332	113	267	115	394	25	77
A LOT OF TIME	101	324	60	156	41	168	44	117	57	207	7	21
	44%	49%	44%	47%	44%	51%	39%	44%	49%	52%	28%	27%
SOME TIME	75	210	45	116	30	94	35	80	40	130	6	32
	33%	32%	33%	35%	33%	28%	31%	30%	35%	33%	24%	42%
JUST A LITTLE	45	117	27	52	18	65	30	63	15	54	10	15
	20%	18%	20%	16%	20%	20%	27%	23%	13%	14%	40%	20%
NO TIME	7	10	4	5	3	5	4	7	3	3	2	8
	3%	1%	3%	2%	3%	1%	3%	3%	3%	1%	8%	10%
DON'T KNOW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1%
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

NUTRITION WAVE II

QUESTION B4 BY L7

TIME SPENT SOCIALIZING AT SITE BY GENDER

	SITE PARTICIPANTS									
	TOTAL		POST-1975 SITES		PRE-1975 SITES		RECENT ENTRY		LONGER TERM	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
TOTAL	473	1256	259	641	214	615	244	610	229	646
A LOT OF TIME	169 36%	565 45%	85 33%	290 45%	84 39%	275 45%	82 34%	229 38%	87 38%	336 52%
SOME TIME	146 31%	422 34%	87 34%	222 35%	59 28%	200 32%	63 26%	210 34%	83 36%	212 33%
JUST A LITTLE	118 25%	215 17%	66 25%	98 15%	52 24%	117 19%	71 29%	130 21%	47 21%	85 13%
NO TIME	36 8%	54 4%	18 7%	31 5%	18 8%	23 4%	25 10%	41 7%	11 5%	13 2%
DON'T KNOW	2 *	0 0	2 1%	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 1%	0 0	0 0	0 0
NO RESPONSE	2 *	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 1%	0 0	1 *	0 0	1 *	0 0

PREPARED BY OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

APPENDIX R

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

CONGREGATE PARTICIPANTS

VS.

HOME-DELIVERED MEAL RECIPIENTS

Discriminant function analyses were performed to identify characteristics of elderly that significantly discriminated between congregate dining participants and home-delivered meal recipients. Two separate discriminant function analyses were conducted: one utilizing program perception variables as discriminant variables (discriminant variable set #1) and one employing demographic, lifestyle and affective characteristics of respondents (discriminant variable set #2). These variable sets were:

Discriminant Variable Set #1

Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Discriminant Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations
Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.F9h : Frequency of Feeling Lonely in Past Few Weeks
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results For Discriminant Variable Set #1

This analysis revealed a canonical correlation of +.82 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (i.e., congregate participants vs. home-delivered meal recipients). The discriminant function correctly classified respondents into these two groups in 92% of cases.

Listed below are variables in the function that maximally discriminated between congregate participants and home-delivered meal recipients. Discriminant variables with larger absolute value standardized discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F Value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 1,208)
Q.A8	+.98	F = 2,432, p < .01
Q.B14	-.14	F = 94.7, p < .01
Q.A10	+.10	F = 27.2, p < .01
Q.B11	-.08	F = 12.9, p < .01
Q.B13	-.07	F = 7.9, p < .01

Results For Discriminant Variable Set #2

This analysis revealed a canonical correlation of +.63 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (i.e., congregate participants vs. home-delivered meal recipients). The discriminant function correctly classified respondents into these two groups in 89% of cases.

Listed below are variables in the function that maximally discriminated between congregate participants and home-delivered meal recipients. Discriminant variables with larger absolute value standardized discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F Value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 1,208)
Q.C1	+.57	F = 384.1, p < .01
Q.C3	+.33	F = 220.7, p < .01
Q.G1	+.32	F = 166.7, p < .01
Q.E6	+.19	F = 148.8, p < .01
Q.D12	+.17	F = 124.5, p < .01
Q.D4	+.15	F = 65.5, p < .01

APPENDIX S

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

CONGREGATE PARTICIPANTS

VS.

HOME-DELIVERED MEAL RECIPIENTS

VS.

FORMER PARTICIPANTS

A multiple discriminant function analysis was conducted to identify demographic, lifestyle, and health characteristics that significantly discriminated between three major samples: current congregate participants, former congregate participants; and home-delivered meal recipients. The discriminant variables used in this analysis included:

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations
Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.F9h : Frequency of Feeling Lonely in Past Few Weeks
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results

This analysis revealed a canonical correlation of +.61 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (i.e., congregate participants, former participants, and home-delivered meal recipients). The discriminant function correctly classified elderly into three groups in 63% of cases.

Listed below are variables in the function that maximally discriminated between the three groups. Discriminant variables with larger absolute value standardized discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the three groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F Value & Associated Significance Level (df = 2 and 4,338
Q.C1	+.55	F = 185.3, p < .01
Q.G1	+.33	F = 83.0, p < .01
Q.C3	+.33	F = 109.2, p < .01
Q.E6	+.19	F = 75.8, p < .01
Q.D12	+.16	F = 61.2, p < .01
Q.D4	+.14	F = 33.5, p < .01

APPENDIX T

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

CURRENT VS. FORMER CONGREGATE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF CONGREGATE SITES

A discriminant function analysis was performed to identify perceptions of congregate meal sites that significantly discriminated between current and former congregate meal program participants. The discriminant variables used in this analysis included:

Q.A8 : Trouble Getting to the Site
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.A10a : Increased Contribution
Q.A12 : Opinion of Meal Cost
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends
Q.B5 : Rated Pleasantness of Site
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B10 : Perceived Savings from Eating Service Meal
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance

Results

This analysis revealed a canonical correlation of +.30 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (i.e., current vs. former congregate dining participants). The discriminant function correctly classified elderly into these two groups in 70% of cases.

Listed below are variables in the function that maximally discriminated between current and former congregate dining participants. Discriminant variables with larger absolute value standardized discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F Value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 1,178
Q.B11	+.46	F = 9.5, p < .01
Q.B10	+.45	F = 33.2, p < .01
Q.A10a	+.40	F = 15.5, p < .01
Q.B4	+.35	F = 32.4, p < .01
Q.A10	+.29	F = 7.2, p < .01
Q.B13	+.27	F = 4.4, p < .05
Q.B5	+.23	F = 18.5, p < .01

APPENDIX U

DIETARY ANALYSES

Dietary Analysis Update for Wave II

Dietary analyses for Wave I were based upon 1974 RDA's, therefore it was necessary to update the Wave II analyses to reflect 1980 RDA's. Table U-1 provides the RDA values used during Wave I and Wave II.

Since significant changes had been made in nutrient fortification levels for flour, cereal products, and ready-to-eat cereals since Wave I, ORC's nutrient data base was also revised. This computerized data base consists of 125 food items and their nutrient composition. The data base was revised to reflect new enrichment standards for those food items significantly affected by enrichment increases and which are consumed in sufficient quantity to have some impact upon the dietary intake of elderly individuals. New enrichment levels reflect the single maximum enrichment values for thiamin, riboflavin, niacin, and calcium. As an illustration of the magnitude of change, we list below the enrichment standard changes per 100 grams of self-rising flour.

Nutrient[1]	Old Standard	New Standard	Percent Increase
Thiamin	.44 mg.	.55 mg.	25%
Riboflavin	.26 mg.	.33 mg.	50%
Niacin	3.53 mg.	4.41 mg.	25%
Calcium	110 mg.	331 mg.	301%

Caloric RDA's Used for Supplemental Caloric Intake Analyses[2]

Sex	Age	RDA Range	RDA
Female	51-75	1,400-2,200 Kcal	1,800 Kcal
Female	76 or older	1,200-2,000 Kcal	1,600 Kcal
Male	51-75	2,000-2,800 Kcal	2,400 Kcal
Male	76 or older	1,650-2,450 Kcal	2,050 Kcal

---

[1] Source: Table 7, Handbook 456: Nutritive Value of American Foods in Common Units, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[2] Source: Recommended Dietary Allowances (Ninth Edition), Committee on Dietary Allowances, Food and Nutrition Board, National Academy of Sciences, 1980.

TABLE U-1

RDA's Used During Wave I Analyses*

	Unit	Males	Females
Energy	(Kcal)	2,400	1,800
Protein	(g)	56	46
Vitamin A	(IU)	5,000	4,000
Vitamin C	(mg)	45	45
Niacin	(mg)	16	12
Riboflavin	(mg)	1.5	1.1
Thiamin	(mg)	1.2	1.0
Calcium	(mg)	800	800
Iron	(mg)	10	10

*Source: Recommended Dietary Allowances (Revised Edition), Food and Nutrition Board, National Academy of Sciences, 1974.

RDA's Used During Wave II Analyses*

	Unit	Males	Females
Energy	(Kcal)	2,400	1,800
Protein	(g)	56	44
Vitamin A[1]	(IU)	5,000	4,000
Vitamin C	(mg)	60	60
Niacin[1]	(mg)	16	13
Riboflavin	(mg)	1.4	1.2
Thiamin	(mg)	1.2	1.0
Calcium	(mg)	800	800
Iron	(mg)	10	10

*Source: Recommended Dietary Allowances (Ninth Edition), Committee on Dietary Allowances, Food and Nutrition Board, National Academy of Sciences, 1980.

[1]Units of measure and RDA have been calculated in a way comparable to that used during Wave I.

APPENDIX V

DIETARY INTAKE DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSES FOR CONGREGATE PARTICIPANTS

Discriminant function analyses were conducted to identify participant perceptions and characteristics and program operations significantly related to overall dietary intake. Participants were classified into two groups based upon the 24-hour dietary recall: those who met or exceeded 2/3 RDA for at least 7 of 9 key nutrients vs. those who did not meet this criterion. Two separate discriminant function analyses were conducted, one employing Discriminant Variable Set #1 (program perceptions and operations), and one using Discriminant Variable Set #2 (demographic, lifestyle, and health characteristics). Listed below are discriminant variables included in each set.

Discriminant Variable Set #1

Q.A1 : Frequency of Meal Site Attendance
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.B2 : Awareness of Site Activities
Q.B3 : Frequency of Participation in Site Activities
Q.B4 : Time Spent Socializing/Visiting Friends at Site
Q.B5 : Rated Pleasantness of Site
Q.B8 : Get Enough to Eat From Site Meal
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance
Q.D14 : Receive Health Care Information Through Site
Q.E14 : Awareness of Site Nutrition Education
Q.E15 : Use of Site Nutrition Education
Q.K5 : Ate at the Meal Site

Program Operations (from Program Staff Interviews).

Estimated Cost Per Meal
Availability of Special Health-Diet Meals
Availability of Special Ethnic-Religious Meals
Meal Prepared by Provider Staff or Contractor/Caterer

Discriminant Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D8 : Difficulty Chewing Food
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.D17 : Weight Change During Past Year
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E2 : Have Hot Meals at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.E10 : Consume a Vitamin/Mineral Supplement

Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G5c : Continuing Encouragement from Someone who Attends Same Religious Service to Attend Meal Site
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations
Q.H1 : Weekly Household Grocery Expenditure
Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.I10 : Respondent Received Food Stamps
Q.I11 : Respondent Receives Medicaid Benefits
Q.I12 : Respondent Receives Rental Assistance
Q.K3 : Ate Differently Yesterday than is Customary
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.F9h : Frequency of Feeling Lonely in Past Few Weeks
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated respondents were considered to be.

Results For Discriminant Variable Set #1

This analysis revealed a very modest canonical correlation of +.28 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (i.e., whether elderly either did or did not meet/exceed 2/3 RDA for 7 of 9 key nutrients). The discriminant function correctly classified elderly into these groups in 60% of cases which is only marginally higher than an a priori probability of 50%. Because the discriminant function accounted for a small percentage of the variance of dietary intake (R_c^2 = 8%), only those discriminant variables that maximally discriminated between the two groups and which had significant univariate F values are listed below as variables that were important discriminators between the two dietary intake groups. Discriminant variables with higher absolute value standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two dietary intake groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F Value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 741)
Q.K5	+.81	F = 27.7, p < .01
Q.B9	+.40	F = 7.3, p < .01

Results For Discriminant Variable Set #2

This analysis revealed a very modest canonical correlation of +.25 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (i.e., whether elderly did or did not meet/exceed 2/3 RDA for 7 of 9 key nutrients). The discriminant function correctly classified elderly into the two dietary intake groups in 63% of cases which is only marginally higher than an a priori probability of 50%. Because the discriminant function accounted for a small percentage of the variance of dietary intake (R_c^2 = 6%), only those discriminant variables that maximally discriminated between the two groups and which had significant univariate F values are listed below as variables that were important discriminators between the two dietary intake groups. Discriminant variables with higher absolute value standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two dietary groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F Value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 741)
Q.I9	+.51	F = 13.8, p < .01
Q.C3	-.34	F = 4.0, p < .05

APPENDIX W

DIETARY INTAKE DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSES FOR HOME-DELIVERED MEAL RECIPIENTS

Discriminant function analyses were conducted to identify home-delivered meal recipients' perceptions and characteristics and program operations significantly related to overall better dietary intake. Home-delivered meal recipients were classified into two groups based upon the 24-hour dietary recall: those who met or exceeded 2/3 RDA for at least 7 of 9 key nutrients vs. those who did not meet this criterion. Two separate function analyses were conducted, one employing Discriminant Variable Set #1 (program perceptions and operations), and one using Discriminant Variable Set #2 (demographic, lifestyle, and health characteristics). Listed below are the discriminant variables included in each set.

Discriminant Variable Set #1

Q.A1 : Frequency of Home-Delivery Service
Q.A10 : Perception of Contributions Policy
Q.B8 : Get Enough to Eat from Home-Delivered Meal
Q.B9 : Food Usually Tastes Good
Q.B11 : Awareness of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B13 : Use of Site Shopping Assistance
Q.B14 : Awareness of Site Medical Assistance
Q.B15 : Use of Site Medical Assistance
Q.D14 : Receive Health Care Information Through Site
Q.K5 : Ate a Program Meal

Program Operations (from Program Staff Interviews)

Estimated Cost Per Meal
Availability of Special Health-Diet Meals
Availability of Special Ethnic-Religious Meals
Meal Prepared by Provider Staff or Contractor/Caterer

Discriminant Variable Set #2

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D8 : Difficulty Chewing Food
Q.D12 : Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.D17 : Weight Change During Past Year
Q.E1 : Eat Alone at Home
Q.E2 : Have Hot Meals at Home
Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8 : Eating Enjoyment

Q.E9 : Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.E10 : Consume a Vitamin/Mineral Supplement
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations
Q.H1 : Weekly Household Grocery Expenditure
Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.I10 : Respondent Receives Food stamps
Q.I11 : Respondent Receives Medicaid Benefits
Q.I12 : Respondent Receives Rental Assistance
Q.K3 : Ate Differently Yesterday than is Customary
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.F9h : Frequency of Feeling Lonely During Past Few Weeks
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated respondents were considered to be.

Results For Discriminant Variable Set #1

This analysis revealed a canonical correlation of +.46 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (i.e., whether elderly either did or did not meet/exceed 2/3 RDA for 7 of 9 key nutrients). The discriminant fuction correctly classified elderly into the two dietary intake groups in 64% of cases. Listed below are variables that maximally discriminated between the two groups. Discriminant variables with higher absolute value standardized discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two dietary intake groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F Value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 123)
Q.K5	+.70	F = 11.8, p < .01
Q.B11	+.60	F = 0.6, p > .05
Type of Meal Preparation	-.50	F = 6.0, p < .05
Q.A.0	-.50	F = 3.5, p > .05
Q.B9	+.41	F = 1.5, p > .05

Results For Discriminant Variable Set #2

This analysis revealed a canonical correlation of +.41 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (i.e., whether elderly did or did not meet/exceed 2/3 RDA for 7 of 9 key nutrients). The discriminant function correctly classified elderly into the two dietary elderly in the two dietary intake groups in 64% of cases. Listed below are the discriminant variables that maximally discriminated between the two groups. Discriminant variables with higher absolute value standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F Value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 123)
Q.I9	+.47	F = 2.2, p > .05
Q.E8	-.46	F = 1.1, p > .05
Q.D12	+.41	F = 0.1, p > .05
Q.D8	+.39	F = 2.6, p > .05
Q.L7	+.36	F = 0.6, p > .05
Q.D13	-.33	F = 1.4, p > .05

APPENDIX X

DIETARY INTAKE DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSES FOR NON-PARTICIPATING NEIGHBORS

A discriminant function analysis was conducted to identify the demographic, health and lifestyle characteristics of non-participating neighbors related to overall better dietary intake. Non-participants were classified into two groups based upon the 24-hour dietary recall: those who met or exceeded 2/3 for at least 7 of 9 key nutrients vs. those who did not meet this criterion. Listed below are the discriminant variables included in the analysis.

Q.C1	:	Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3	:	Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D1-D2	:	Number of Illness-Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D4	:	Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D8	:	Difficulty Chewing Food
Q.D12	:	Self-rated Current Health
Q.D13	:	Health Relative to Last Year's
Q.D17	:	Weight Change During Past Year
Q.E1	:	Eat Alone at Home
Q.E2	:	Have Hot Meals at Home
Q.E4	:	Normal Meal Preparation
Q.E6	:	Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.E8	:	Eating Enjoyment
Q.E9	:	Rated Nutritiousness of Meals Generally Eaten
Q.E10	:	Consume a Vitamin/Mineral Supplement
Q.F2	:	Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9e	:	Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.G1	:	Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G6	:	Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations
Q.H1	:	Weekly Household Grocery Expenditure
Q.H2	:	Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I1	:	Marital Status
Q.I5	:	Age
Q.I6	:	Education
Q.I9	:	Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income
Q.I10	:	Respondent Receives Food stamps
Q.I11	:	Respondent Receives Medicaid Benefits
Q.I12	:	Respondent Receives Rental Assistance
Q.K3	:	Ate Differently Yesterday than is Customary
Q.L7	:	Gender
Q.L8	:	Minority Status

Isolation

Isolation is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.F9h : Frequency of Feeling Lonely During Past Few Weeks
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated elderly were considered to be.

Results

The analysis revealed a canonical correlation of +.31 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (i.e., whether elderly either did or did not meet/exceed 2/3 RDA for 7 of 9 key nutrients). The discriminant function correctly classified elderly into the two dietary intake groups in 66% of cases. Listed below are variables that maximally discriminated between the two groups. Discriminant variables with higher absolute value standardized discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two dietary intake groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F Value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 669)
Q.I1	+.66	F = 0.0, p > .05
Q.I9	+.47	F = 17.7, p < .01
Q.I10	+.44	F = 11.8, p < .01
Q.E1	+.39	F = 2.4, p > .05
Q.E4	+.39	F = 3.8, p ≈ .05

APPENDIX Y

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

TRACKED PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
WHO HAVE REMAINED IN THE PROGRAM

VS.

TRACKED NON-PARTICIPATING NEIGHBORS
WHO HAVE REMAINED NON-PARTICIPANTS

A discriminant function analysis was conducted to identify Wave II characteristics that differentiated between tracked program participants and tracked non-participating neighbors. The discriminant variables were drawn from five important program impact areas:

Mobility

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D5 : Use of Aids

Health and Institutionalization

Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D3 : Time Bedridden Due to Illness in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year

Psychological Well-Being

Q.F1 : Mood on Day Interviewed
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9c : Frequency of Feeling Bored During Past Few Weeks
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.F9g : Frequency of Feeling Restless During Past Few Weeks
Q.F9i : Frequency of Feeling Pleased That Things Were "Going (Respondent's) Way" During Past Few Weeks

Isolation/Social Activity Level

Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Isolation: This is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.F9h : Frequency of Feeling Lonely During Past Few Weeks
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated respondents were considered to be.

Income and Perceived Income Sufficiency

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income

Demographic and Lifestyle Variables

Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Results

The analysis revealed a canonical correlation of +.41 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (tracked participants vs. non-participants whose program status has not changed since Wave I). The discriminant function correctly classified respondents into these two respondent groups in 68% of cases. Listed below are variables that maximally discriminated between the two groups. Discriminant variables with higher absolute value standardized discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two respondent groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 422)
G1	+.49	F = 29.3, p < .01
C1	+.48	F = 16.3, p < .01
G6	+.36	F = 12.1, p < .01
Isolation	-.31	F = 7.5, p < .01
L7	-.28	F = 6.3, p < .05

APPENDIX Z

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

TRACKED PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
WHO HAVE REMAINED PARTICIPANTS

VS.

TRACKED PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
WHO HAVE LEFT THE PROGRAM

A discriminant function analysis was conducted to identify Wave II characteristics that differentiated between tracked program participants who had remained participants or left the program since Wave I. The discriminant variables were drawn from five important program impact areas:

Mobility

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D5 : Use of Aids

Health and Institutionalization

Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D3 : Time Bedridden Due to Illness in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year

Psychological Well-Being

Q.F1 : Mood on Day Interviewed
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9c : Frequency of Feeling Bored During Past Few Weeks
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.F9g : Frequency of Feeling Restless During Past Few Weeks
Q.F9i : Frequency of Feeling Pleased That Things Were "Going (Respondent's) Way" During Past Few Weeks

Isolation/Social Activity Level

Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Isolation: This is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.F9h : Frequency of Feeling Lonely During Past Few Weeks
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated respondents were considered to be.

Income and Perceived Income Sufficiency

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income

Demographic and Lifestyle Variables

Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Results

The analysis revealed a very modest canonical correlation of +.31 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (i.e. tracked Wave I participants who had either remained in the program or had left it since Wave I). The discriminant functino correctly classified respondents into these groups in 69% of cases. Because the discriminant function accounted for a small percentage of the variance of group membership (R_c = 10%), only those discriminant variables that maximally discriminated between groups and which had significant univariate F values are listed below as important discriminant variables. Discriminant variables with higher absolute value standardized discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two respondent groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 371)
C1	+.67	F = 19.9, p < .01
G1	+.32	F = 7.3, p < .01
D13	+.30	F = 7.1, p < .01

APPENDIX AA

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

TRACKED NON-PARTICIPATING NEIGHBORS
WHO HAVE REMAINED NON-PARTICIPANTS

VS.

TRACKED NON-PARTICIPATING NEIGHBORS
WHO HAVE ENTERED THE PROGRAM

A discriminant function analysis was conducted to identify Wave II characteristics that differentiated between tracked non-participating neighbors who had remained non-participants and those who enrolled in the program since Wave I. The discriminant variables were drawn from five important program impact areas.

Mobility

Q.C1 : Frequency of Getting Out of the House
Q.C3 : Ability to Clean and Maintain Home
Q.D5 : Use of Aids

Health and Institutionalization

Q.D1-D2: Number of Illness Related Doctor Visits in Past Year
Q.D3 : Time Bedridden Due to Illness in Past Year
Q.D4 : Time in Hospital/Nursing Home in Past Year
Q.D13 : Health Relative to Last Year

Psychological Well-Being

Q.F1 : Mood on Day Interviewed
Q.F2 : Anticipating Doing Something Next Week
Q.F9c : Frequency of Feeling Bored During Past Few Weeks
Q.F9e : Frequency of Feeling Depressed/Very Unhappy During Past Few Weeks
Q.F9g : Frequency of Feeling Restless During Past Few Weeks
Q.F9i : Frequency of Feeling Pleased That Things Were "Going (Respondent's) Way" During Past Few Weeks

Isolation/Social Activity Level

Q.E6 : Frequency of Inviting Others to Eat at Home
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.G1 : Attendance at Religious Services
Q.G6 : Membership in Clubs, Lodges, or Other Social Organizations

Isolation: This is a composite variable combining an individual's scores on the following items.

Q.I4 : Live Alone
Q.F6 : Have Enough Friends
Q.F7 : Presence of Confidante
Q.F9h : Frequency of Feeling Lonely During Past Few Weeks
Q.G8/G9: Have Living Children Who Visit

The higher the score, the more isolated respondents were considered to be.

Income and Perceived Income Sufficiency

Q.H2 : Perceived Income Sufficiency
Q.I9 : Reported/Estimated 1981 Family Income

Demographic and Lifestyle Variables

Q.E4 : Normal Meal Preparation
Q.I1 : Marital Status
Q.I5 : Age
Q.I6 : Education
Q.L7 : Gender
Q.L8 : Minority Status

Results

The analysis revealed a modest canonical correlation of +.34 between the linear discriminant function and group membership (tracked non-participants who remained non-participants vs. those who enrolled in the program since Wave I). The discriminant function correctly classified respondents into these two groups in 70% of cases. Because the discriminant function accounted for a small percentage of the variance of group membership (R_C = 11%), only those discriminant variables that maximally discriminated between groups and which had significant univariate F values are listed below as important discriminant variables . Discriminant variables with higher absolute value standardized discriminant function coefficients better discriminated between the two respondent groups.

Discriminant Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Univariate F value & Associated Significance Level (df = 1 and 218)
L8	+.64	F = 8.4, p < .01
I6	+.41	F = 5.2, p < .05